

5-1-1969

Fringe Benefits in a Selected Group of Junior Colleges

William Lewis Woodson
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

Recommended Citation

Woodson, William Lewis, "Fringe Benefits in a Selected Group of Junior Colleges" (1969). *Student Work*. 2512.
<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/2512>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu.



FRINGE BENEFITS IN A SELECTED
GROUP OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

A Thesis
Presented to the
Department of Education
and the
Faculty of the Graduate College
University of Nebraska at Omaha

In Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

by
William Lewis Woodson

May, 1969

UMI Number: EP74057

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP74057

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College of the University of Nebraska at Omaha, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Master of Arts.

Graduate Committee	<u>George Rackford</u>	<u>Education</u>
	Name	Department
	<u>A. W. Gorman</u>	
	<u>E. S. Carter</u>	
	<u>Charles M. Duce</u>	

<u>George Rackford</u>
Chairman

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. THE PROBLEM AND FRINGE BENEFITS STUDIED	1
Introduction	1
The Problem	2
Statement of the problem	2
Importance of the study	3
Definitions of Terms Used	3
Retirement program	3
Insurance program	3
Tenure	3
Sabbatical leaves	4
Faculty travel expense	4
Faculty housing	4
Faculty family education	4
Mortgage loans	4
Personal loans	4
Public junior colleges	4
Private junior colleges	4
Fringe benefit	5
II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	6
Literature Concerning Studies of Fringe Benefits . . .	6
Literature and Articles Concerning the Subject of	
Fringe Benefits	18

CHAPTER	PAGE
III. THE NUMBER OF JUNIOR COLLEGES SURVEYED AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	22
Extent of the survey	22
Description of the questionnaire	26
IV. RETIREMENT PROGRAMS	30
V. INSURANCE PROGRAMS	39
VI. TENURE	48
VII. SABBATICAL LEAVES	58
VIII. FACULTY TRAVEL	72
IX. FACULTY HOUSING	83
X. FACULTY FAMILY EDUCATION	94
XI. MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAMS	101
XII. PERSONAL LOAN PROGRAMS	104
XIII. EVALUATIONS OF FRINGE BENEFIT PROGRAMS	110
XIV. SUMMARY AND CONSLUSIONS	115
BIBLIOGRAPHY	120
APPENDIX	122

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
I. Professional Staff Members in Junior Colleges, 1963--1964	10
II. Public Junior Colleges Surveyed and Number Responding to the Questionnaire on Fringe Benefits	23
III. Public Junior Colleges Responding by Type of Control . .	25
IV. Private Junior Colleges Surveyed and Number Responding to the Questionnaire on Fringe Benefits	27
V. Private Junior Colleges Responding by Type of Control . .	28
VI. Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing Retirement Programs	31
VII. Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Paying at Least a Portion of the Retirement Premium	32
VIII. Evaluation of Retirement Programs by Public Junior Colleges	33
IX. Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Providing Retirement Programs	35
X. Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Paying at Least a Portion of the Retirement Premium	36
XI. Evaluation of Retirement Programs by Private Junior Colleges	37
XII. Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing Group Health and Life Insurance Programs	40
XIII. Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Paying at Least a Portion of the Group Health and Life Insurance Premiums	41

TABLE

PAGE

XIV.	Evaluation of Group Health and Life Insurance Programs by Public Junior Colleges	42
XV.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Providing Group Health and Life Insurance Programs	44
XVI.	Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Paying at Least a Portion of the Group Health and Life Insurance Premiums	45
XVII.	Evaluation of Group Health and Life Insurance Programs by Private Junior Colleges	46
XVIII.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing a Program of Tenure	49
XIX.	Number of Years of Service Required by Public Junior Colleges for Eligibility for Tenure	51
XX.	Evaluation of the Tenure Program by Public Junior Colleges	52
XXI.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Providing a Program of Tenure	54
XXII.	Number of Years of Service Required by Private Junior Colleges for Eligibility for Tenure	55
XXIII.	Evaluation of the Tenure Program by Private Junior Colleges	57
XXIV.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing Programs for Sabbatical Leaves	59

TABLE

PAGE

XXV.	Number of Years of Service Required by Public Junior Colleges for Eligibility for First Sabbatical Leave . . .	60
XXVI.	Number of Public Junior Colleges Requiring Tenure as a Condition for Eligibility for Sabbatical Leaves . . .	61
XXVII.	Number of Years of Service Required by Public Junior Colleges for Eligibility for Second Sabbatical Leave	63
XXVIII.	Evaluation of the Sabbatical Leave Program by Public Junior Colleges	64
XXIX.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Providing Programs for Sabbatical Leaves	65
XXX.	Number of Years of Service Required by Private Junior Colleges for Eligibility for First Sabbatical Leave . . .	67
XXXI.	Number of Private Junior Colleges Requiring Tenure as a Condition for Eligibility for Sabbatical Leaves . . .	68
XXXII.	Number of Years of Service Required by Private Junior Colleges for Eligibility for Second Sabbatical Leave . . .	70
XXXIII.	Evaluation of the Sabbatical Leave Program by Private Junior Colleges	71
XXXIV.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Having Specified Limits on Faculty Travel Reimbursement . . .	73
XXXV.	Formula for Reimbursement of Travel Expense by Public Junior Colleges	74

TABLE

PAGE

XXXVI.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Paying a Portion or All of the Moving Expense for New Faculty Members * * * * *	75
XXXVII.	Evaluation of the Faculty Travel Program by Public Junior Colleges * * * * *	77
XXXVIII.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Having Specified Limits on Faculty Travel Reimbursement . .	78
XXXIX.	Formula for Reimbursement of Travel Expense by Private Junior Colleges * * * * *	79
XL.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Paying a Portion or all of the Moving Expense for New Faculty Members * * * * *	80
XLI.	Evaluation of the Faculty Travel Program by Private Junior Colleges * * * * *	82
XLII.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Having College-Owned Housing * * * * *	84
XLIII.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Using a Priority System in the Assignment of Housing and the Type of Priority System Used * * * * *	85
XLIV.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Provid- ing Housing in Lieu of Compensation * * * * *	86
XLV.	Evaluation of the Faculty Housing Program by Public Junior Colleges * * * * *	88

TABLE

PAGE

XLVI.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Having College-Owned Housing	89
XLVII.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Using a Priority System in the Assignment of Housing and the Type of Priority System Used	90
XLVIII.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Provid- ing Housing in Lieu of Compensation	92
XLIX.	Evaluation of the Faculty Housing Program by Private Junior Colleges	93
L.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing Waivers of Part or All of the Tuition Charge for Fac- ulty Members and Their Families	95
LI.	Evaluation of the Faculty Family Education Program by Public Junior Colleges	97
LII.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Provid- ing Waivers of Part or All of the Tuition Charge for Faculty Members and Their Families	98
LIII.	Evaluation of the Faculty Family Education Program by Private Junior Colleges	100
LIV.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Provid- ing a Plan for Mortgage Loans to Faculty Members	102
LV.	Evaluation of the Mortgage Loan Program by Private Junior Colleges	103

TABLE

PAGE

LVI.	Number and Per Cent of Public Junior Colleges Providing Credit Unions for College Faculty Only and Programs for Making Personal Loans to Faculty by the College	105
LVII.	Evaluation of Personal Loan Programs by Public Junior Colleges	106
LVIII.	Number and Per Cent of Private Junior Colleges Providing Credit Unions for College Faculty Only and Programs for Making Personal Loans to Faculty by the College	107
LIX.	Evaluation of Personal Loan Programs by Private Junior Colleges	109
LX.	Evaluations of Fringe Benefit Programs by Public Junior Colleges	112
LXI.	Evaluations of Fringe Benefit Programs by Private Junior Colleges	113

CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND FRINGE BENEFITS STUDIED

I. INTRODUCTION

The rapidly increasing numbers of junior college students and the mushrooming number of junior colleges has created a critical need for recruiting qualified faculty members as well as retaining those faculty members already in the profession. While the problem of salary and remuneration is important, it is becoming increasingly clear that all of the forms of fringe benefits which are a part of the total financial package are becoming an increasingly critical consideration in the employment and retention of faculty. The two-fold problem of competing in the open market with business and industry for highly trained and qualified personnel, and at the same time, of exercising an even more analytical and critical control of the allocation of available funds to the many functions of an institution's operations, has created a greater need than ever for evaluating as thoroughly as possible the various expenditures for obtaining and retaining personnel for our junior colleges.

Enrollment in the nation's junior colleges for the fall of 1967 rose from 1,464,099 to 1,671,440, 14 per cent more than in 1966, and 23 per cent more than in 1965.¹ Junior College enrollment in 1965 was

¹1968 Junior College Directory (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968), p. 6.

only 1,292,753.² The total number of colleges listed in the 1968 Junior College Directory was 912, which was 141 more than the total of 711 listed just two years before in the 1966 Junior College Directory.

Faculty, including both instructional and administrative personnel, totaled 85,854 in 1966-67.³ Total faculty in 1964-65 was 60,454, reflecting an increase of 25,408, or 29 per cent, over a period of only two years.⁴

The spiraling growth in the enrollments of the nation's junior colleges, with the resultant demand for constantly greater numbers of faculty members has intensified the need for analyzing the various costs of recruiting and retaining qualified faculty members.

II. THE PROBLEM

Statement of the problem. The purpose of this study was to determine the kinds of fringe benefits which were provided, and to determine to what extent, in the opinion of the administrators, that these benefits contributed to their success in recruiting and retaining quality faculty members. The study was predicated on the assumption that fringe benefits do attract and retain faculty members,

²1968 Junior College Directory (Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968), p. 6.

³1968 Junior College Directory, op. cit., p. 68.

⁴1966 Junior College Directory, op. cit., p. 56.

and that without them the schools will find it difficult to attract and retain qualified faculty.

Importance of the study. The growth in fringe benefit programs which has engulfed the American business scene has given increased emphasis to the need to compete in similar measure on the college campus, if faculty members are to be successfully recruited and retained in the contest with the financial inducements offered by business and industry. Many older and well-established junior colleges have evolved various types of fringe benefit programs which should serve to provide a base of experience from which to draw some conclusions concerning the merits of different benefit programs. This study was important because of the evaluation of how well the fringe benefit program was used as a tool to recruit and retain faculty.

III. DEFINITIONS OF TERMS USED

Retirement program. A plan providing a monthly annuity to faculty members upon the termination of their active service to the college, and upon their attainment of the specified age, and the fulfillment of all applicable conditions of the program.

Insurance program. A plan including either a group medical insurance policy or a group life insurance policy, or a combination of both, for the benefit of all participating faculty.

Tenure. The right to a continuous position on the faculty of the college, subject to the applicable conditions of the program.

Sabbatical leaves. Leaves of absence with the provision of at least a certain portion of the faculty member's regular salary.

Faculty travel expense. An arrangement for reimbursing the faculty for the expenses of travel to conferences, professional meetings, and other school activities which benefit the individual and the college, and which contribute to the individual's professional growth.

Faculty housing. Housing owned by the college for rental by the faculty as a convenience to the faculty, and as an inducement in recruiting faculty.

Faculty family education. A plan for providing tuition waivers to faculty members and members of their families.

Mortgage loans. Loan programs providing funds for the purchase of homes by faculty members.

Personal loans. Loan programs providing funds for personal needs either through a faculty credit union or loans made by the college itself.

Public junior colleges. Colleges supported by tax appropriations, and including junior colleges supported by the states, and junior colleges supported by appropriations from the districts or communities in which they are located.

Private junior colleges. Colleges receiving no tax support, and

including private junior colleges with no denominational or other organizational affiliation, and church-related junior colleges related to, and supported by, a church or denominational body.

Fringe benefit. Consideration given for services rendered, having economic value to the recipient, and having some form other than that of direct salary.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

During the 1930's, the 1940's and the early 1950's, salary levels in higher education increased only very gradually, but by the mid-1950's, this growth rate spurted upward very dramatically.⁵ With this pronounced increase in levels of remuneration has come increased concern for greater understanding and evaluation of not only salaries themselves, but the fringe benefit programs as well which have come to form a greater part of the increasingly complex sphere of the total package of faculty remuneration. Out of this concern in the last fifteen years has come numerous studies at all levels of the educational spectrum relating to the subject of fringe benefits. A summary of a few of the studies made and articles written which are closely related to this study will here be given.

I. LITERATURE CONCERNING STUDIES OF FRINGE BENEFITS

In a 1963 study of fringe benefits in four-year colleges and universities, Mark H. Ingraham made a survey of 1,003 institutions.⁶ His report, The Outer Fringe, Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance, covered a series of benefits, excluding annuities and insurance,

⁵Peggy Heim and William J. Baumol, "On the Fringe, The State of Retirement Contributions and Other Nonpecuniary Faculty Benefits," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XLVIII (December, 1967) pp. 346-358.

⁶Mark H. Ingraham, The Outer Fringe, Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance (Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965).

but it included faculty housing, mortgage loans, personal loans, faculty travel expenses, leaves of absence, faculty club, faculty family education, faculty parking, general campus facilities, privileges of retired faculty and faculty widows, other faculty benefits, and experience in recruiting and retaining faculty. His information was based on responses from 745 institutions.

He opposed some of the less substantial benefits, such as personal loans; minimized others, such as parking; and questioned some, such as the wisdom of institutions which pay more toward travel for those who give papers at professional meetings than for those who only attend, on the ground that this encourages the preparation of ill-considered papers for delivery at distant meetings. However, he supported the more substantial benefit programs: retirement programs, major medical insurance, and time for scholarly pursuits for the benefit of the academic profession.

Ingraham found a wide variety of programs in existence across the country, in each of the categories studied, but found that there tended to be no constant value for these programs. So many variables in local institutional conditions tended to create great variety in the apparent value of many of the programs for recruiting and retaining faculty members. Comparative values of the fringe benefits seemed to play a greater role in recruiting and retaining faculty than any possible absolute values.

Howard D. Marshall, in a study of the supply of faculty housing, found that the degree of difficulty experienced by faculty members in securing housing was, to a certain extent at least, a function of the

amount of housing provided by the institutions concerned.⁷ Of the sixty-seven institutions responding to Marshall's questionnaire, forty-nine, or 73 per cent, provided some housing.⁸ This figure was about 60 per cent in Ingraham's study.⁹ Thus, enough importance was attached to the provision of housing that approximately two-thirds of the institutions were providing housing in some degree.

Roy C. Maul attempted an extended six-year study of the recruiting of faculty for staffing junior colleges across the nation. He studied the growing number of junior colleges along with the rapidly increasing demand for teachers to staff these colleges, and he concluded that:

The entire educational enterprise, elementary, secondary, and higher, faces keen competition in the open manpower market; business, industry, government, and private professional practice extend open arms to the short supply of educated personnel with the competencies required for successful classroom service. In a very real sense the junior college is in competition not only with other junior colleges, but with all other educational institutions and an ever-growing number of occupations in the expanding American economy. More, rather than less, difficult times inevitably lie ahead.¹⁰

Maul goes on to state:

The facts brought to light in six years of study support the realization that a major problem--if not the most critical one--of the years ahead will be to staff the rapidly expanding junior colleges with competent teachers. These teachers must

⁷Howard D. Marshall, "Supply of Faculty Housing," Liberal Education, LI (December, 1965), p. 537.

⁸Ibid., p. 537.

⁹Ingraham, op. cit., p. 224.

¹⁰Roy C. Maul, "Can We Get Enough Good Teachers," Junior College Journal, XXXIV (December, 1963), pp. 4-5.

be bought in the open manpower market. Not only the colleges and universities and many of the high schools, but also an ever-growing number of occupations outside education will be courting the most coveted prospective candidates. The salary structures of the junior colleges of the nation thus come into even sharper focus.¹¹

In a later study Maul sought to determine whether junior college salaries were competitive.¹² He found the median salary for nine-month teaching in public junior colleges had gone from \$5,460 in 1955-56 to \$7,828 in 1963-64.¹³ Maul found that although the median per cent of increase in salaries was greater for nonpublic junior colleges in every year except 1957-58 and 1963-64, it seemed evident from his data that the nonpublic junior colleges were losing ground in the level of their salaries as compared with the public junior colleges.

James W. Reynolds made a study of the percentages of men and women on junior college staffs, which is summarized in the table below.¹⁴

¹¹Ibid., p. 7.

¹²Roy C. Maul, "Are Junior College Salaries Competitive?" Junior College Journal, XXXLV (March, 1964), pp. 20-23.

¹³Ibid., p. 21

¹⁴James W. Reynolds, The Junior College (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965).

TABLE I
PROFESSIONAL STAFF MEMBERS IN JUNIOR COLLEGES
1963-1964

Type of Institution	Per Cent Men	Per Cent Women
State	76.3%	23.7%
Local	72.7	27.3
District	74.2	25.8
Church	53.4	46.6
Independent	67.9	32.1

Reynolds found no conclusive evidence to explain the finding that the per cent of women employed in private and church related institutions was higher than in public junior colleges. One probability offered by Reynolds was the possibility that the professional staff salaries in a large number of denominational junior colleges were comparatively low, and the existing differential in salaries for men and women caused positions with the lower-salaries to be filled with women. Reynolds made no comparisons of fringe benefits and had no conclusions concerning any possible impact that might have been made by this factor.

Oscar N. Serbein reported on one phase of an extensive research program carried out by Columbia's Committee on the Future of the University. Questionnaires were sent to fifty leading colleges and universities.¹⁵

¹⁵Oscar N. Serbein, "Fringe Benefit Programs and Salaries in Forty-nine Colleges and Universities," Higher Education, XIV, No. 2 (October, 1957), pp. 17-22.

The questionnaire was designed to obtain facts on fringe benefit programs. Although this study was concerned with senior colleges, the results have significance for junior colleges. Of the forty-nine institutions which replied, ten were small private colleges, eighteen were large private universities, nineteen were state universities, and two were institutions of technology. A total of thirty-one benefits were covered. They found that no institution had more than twenty-two nor less than eight of the programs. In this study, seven programs were considered major: retirement, Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance, group life insurance, noninsured medical benefits, insured medical benefits, salary during disability, and group disability.

They found that only one institution did not have an institutionally sponsored group retirement program. Forty-one of the institutions participated in Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance, thirty-eight provided group life programs, seven provided medical benefits on a non-insurance basis, forty-six institutions had insured medical benefit programs, forty-seven provided for salary during disability, but only fourteen carried group disability insurance. Participation in the other twenty-four benefits listed in the questionnaire varied considerably from one or two institutions in some benefits to forty-five in one benefit program. They concluded that considerable variation in fringe benefit programs and in the participation therein seemed to be the rule. Eight programs, counting occasionals--retirement, Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance, insured medical benefits, salary during disability, travel expense to meetings, research leave, individual offices, and services for the retired--were had by forty or more of the institutions surveyed. This list is reduced to

four--retirement (other than Federal Old Age and Survivors Insurance), insured medical benefits, salary during disability, and travel expense to meetings, if occasionals are removed. However, this was only a counting of benefits and does not pretend to give a complete picture of quality or extent of the programs studied. Also, the data applies only to the forty-nine institutions who responded to the survey. The authors concluded that in most institutions there was considerable room for improvement in the quality and extent of the various fringe benefit programs offered.

Norman Blume made a study of fringe benefits covering institutions in Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan.¹⁶ Illinois was included in the original survey, but was excluded from the report due to a lack of a sufficient number of responses from that state. The emphasis in his study was on discovering the degree of acceptance by degree-granting institutions, of basic fringe benefits in the three-state area of Ohio, Indiana, and Michigan. In contrast to some other studies, he focused on institutions in a region rather than a particular class or the national scene at large. He attempted to determine some idea of the effect geographical proximity had on fringe benefits.

Blume concluded that, in general, the programs accepted by 75 per cent or better of the colleges and universities in each aggregate were retirement, medical insurance, and travel allowances. He also stated that

Norman Blume, "Faculty Fringe Benefits," Improving College and University Teaching, XIV, No. 4 (Autumn, 1966), pp. 270-272.

geographically, it appears on the average that the fringe benefit plans are more uniform within a state than between states.¹⁷

Blume's study reflected a lower showing of the public institutions in the average number of benefit programs adopted, and he suggested that the tendency toward higher salaries in public institutions might be the chief reason for this relatively poor showing, and also that this poor showing tended to support that conclusion of the Heim and Baumol study concerning the level of contributions to retirement programs and their relationship to faculty salaries.¹⁸

William C. Greenough and Francis P. King collaborated on a study of retirement and insurance programs in American colleges and universities. In a report on one phase of this study, Greenough ferreted out the provisions of retirement planning in private colleges and universities from the broader statistics of the larger study.¹⁹ He summarized their findings in regard to the provisions of retirement plans in private colleges and universities, and presented data concerning requirements for participation, classes of employees covered, and retirement ages. Greenough found in studying the growth of retirement plans that in 1948 there were about 330 college retirement plans in operation, or in about 50 per cent of the private colleges and universities. By 1950 this figure had grown to 490, or about 70 per cent of the private colleges

¹⁷Ibid, p. 271.

¹⁸Heim and Baumol, op. cit., pp. 346-358.

¹⁹William C. Greenough, "Retirement Planning in Private College and Universities," Liberal Education, XLV (December, 1959), pp. 564-577.

and universities. These institutions employed 88 per cent of the teachers in private higher education. Only eighty-four institutions indicated that they had no retirement plan, and one-hundred seventeen made no reply. Over 85 per cent of the private colleges and universities had compulsory plans, and the vast majority required participation, usually by age thirty.²⁰ All classes of employees were usually brought into the retirement plan. The retirement age at most colleges and universities seemed to span a period of only five years: from sixty-five to seventy.²¹

In a summary of findings on vesting practices, Greenough reported that full vesting of all normal retirement benefits was found in more than 80 per cent of private colleges and universities.²² Greenough also discussed their findings concerning the adequacy of retirement benefits.

Francis P. King presented a summary of data on insurance plans in private colleges derived from his study with Greenough on retirement and insurance programs.²³ His data showed that 67 per cent of the teachers employed in the 980 institutions surveyed, were covered by life insurance plans, and that 51 per cent of the institutions had life insurance plans. A total of 86.5 per cent of the private institutions provided hospital-

²⁰William C. Greenough, op. cit., p. 566.

²¹Ibid., p. 568.

²²Ibid., p. 571.

²³Francis P. King, "Insurance Programs in Private Colleges and Universities," Liberal Education, XLVI (October, 1960), pp. 331-344.

surgical-medical plans covering 87.9 per cent of the total number of teachers employed. Only 21.7 per cent provided plans for group major medical insurance. A total of 30.8 per cent had plans for income continuation during disability of less than six months. He stated that the last dozen years, prior to 1960, have seen the doubling of the number of life insurance plans for staff members in higher education, and that there is an increasing acceptance of basic hospital-surgical-medical plans, major medical plans, and total disability income plans. He draws the conclusion that these plans are helping the colleges to meet successfully the competition for personnel.

Peggy Heim and William J. Baumol made a study of the level of contributions to fringe benefit programs. In their survey they found that 20 per cent of the institutions were spending an amount on fringe benefits equal to 6 per cent or less of the faculty salary budget, while only 30 per cent of the institutions paid benefits as high as 10 per cent of the faculty salary budget. Only two of the colleges and universities offered benefits which exceeded 20 per cent of their salary payments.

Heim and Baumol also found that the public universities lagged far behind their private counterparts in almost all fringe benefit programs. As an example, they point out that while "forty-five per cent of the public universities for which data are available contribute part or all of the premium cost for group life insurance, ninety-three per cent of the private universities provide this benefit. The same public-private distribution

is apparent for the liberal arts colleges."²⁴ Heim and Baumol also found that the liberal arts colleges generally tended to move more slowly than the universities--for any type of control--in the introduction of new programs.

Heim and Baumol emphasized the importance of periodic re-evaluation of the institution's contributions to the retirement plan to make sure that changing economic conditions ~~were being~~ adequately covered by modifications in the program. Inflation and the lengthening in annuitant life expectancy have had adverse effects on programs designed in periods of slowly rising salaries.

Erwin Dingman studied 101 public school systems throughout the country, and on the basis of seventy-seven responses, drew some conclusions not only concerning the type and extent of benefits offered but also concerning economic conditions related to the growth of fringe benefits.²⁵ He found that fringe benefits tended to develop most markedly in periods when labor was scarce, and that this increase seemed to parallel the rise in personal income taxes. Dingman concluded that fringe benefits in education will continue to develop both as an inducement to teaching, and as a partial counter-balance to the withholding tax on salaries. He suggested that a continued short supply of teachers was likely to result in an acceleration of fringe benefit provisions for educational personnel.

²⁴Heim and Baumol, op. cit., p. 349.

²⁵Erwin Dingman, "School Practices in Fringe Benefits," The American School Board Journal, CXLI, No. 2 (August, 1961), pp. 7-8.

A Joint Committee of the American Association of University Professors and the Association of American Colleges reported on a study of retirement policies in the March, 1950 issue of the American Association of University Professors Bulletin.²⁶ This was a study for the clarification of the nature of retirement policies. A resume was presented of previous and present policies relating to academic retirement with emphasis on the present status of retirement policies. An analysis was made on the basis of questionnaires sent to 200 institutions and 1,000 Teachers Insurance and Annuity Association annuitants. From this study a statement of principles was prepared as a guideline for institutions concerning the nature of their retirement policy and its provisions.

Robert D. Henderson, assisted by W. L. Berry, conducted a survey in 1956 of twenty-three small, medium, and large companies with a total of more than 240,000 employees. He found in his survey that there had been significant developments in fringe benefits occurring in industry in recent years, and that these were contributing substantially to the welfare of the worker and his family. Although Henderson's study dealt with developments in fringe benefits in business and industry rather than in colleges, it pointed up the growth in fringe benefits in business and industry with which colleges and universities are competing for talented personnel. Henderson found that worker income and labor costs were no longer accurately measured by weekly wages or work produced. Fringes

²⁶"Academic Retirement and Related Subjects," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XXXVI (March, 1950), pp. 97-117.

were plus-wage benefits that were a part of a company's total compensation program.

In a summary of his findings, Henderson showed that the small companies, having from 50 to 999 employees, offered a total of 115 benefits out of a possible maximum of 168, or 68 per cent of the total possible benefits included in a six-category questionnaire. The medium size companies, having from 1,000 to 10,000 employees, offered a total of 174 out of 231 possible benefits, or 75 per cent. The large firms, with more than 10,000 employees, offered a total of 64 out of 84 possible benefits, or 80 per cent. Of the total potential benefits available to all companies, about 74 per cent were actually received by employees in the various companies.²⁷

II. LITERATURE AND ARTICLES CONCERNING THE SUBJECT OF FRINGE BENEFITS

In a 1966 report Melvin Lurie took a look, from the viewpoint of an economist, at a possible method of applying management science to college and university operations; that is, a possible means of increasing the effectiveness of manpower management in higher education.²⁸ Lurie specifically proposed "the collection and publication, on an annual basis, of faculty-turnover rates."²⁹ He suggested in this regard,

²⁷Robert N. Henderson, "Fringe Benefits, a 1956 Study," Personnel and Guidance Journal, XXXVII (December, 1957), pp. 259-262.

²⁸Melvin Lurie, "Toward a Survey of Faculty-Turnover Rates; Increasing the Effectiveness of Manpower Management in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVII (October, 1966), pp. 389-395.

²⁹Ibid., p. 390.

that "the demand for education, even at rising prices, will be as great in comparison with future teaching resources that the economic utilization of teachers will become the chief determinant in maintaining the quality of education."³⁰

Lurie cited the growth in the publication of various turnover rates by the U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, and suggested that this growth in the number of turnover rates published reflected the value of these reports to management in American industry. He suggested that a faculty-turnover series would be useful to economists and administrators interested in manpower studies of higher education as an industry. Lurie's proposal concentrated on only one turnover statistic--the voluntary quit-rate--because he felt that this rate would allow the administrator to assess the faculty labor market and the relative standing of the faculty at his institution with regard to this market. By making comparisons of the quit-rate at his institution with the normal quit-rate, the administrator can, he hypothesises, obtain data concerning faculty-administrator relations, and data for approximating the positive or negative preferences of the faculty at a given institution with regard to the terms of their employment. Lurie felt that since this rate reflected a deliberate choice to move from one institution to another, "it should yield a higher degree of accuracy than any response that might be given by a teacher to the question whether he would move if he had the choice."³¹ He concluded that this objective analysis might be used very effectively by college administrators to assess job satis-

³⁰Ibid., p. 390.

³¹Ibid., p. 392.

faction of faculty members, including their satisfaction with the institutions fringe or non-cash benefit programs.

One of the purposes in making this junior college study was to assemble data on faculty turnover rates in junior colleges as an additional objective means of evaluating the faculty satisfaction with the fringe benefit programs in the junior colleges studied.

The Economic Unit of the U. S. News and World Report reported on a survey of the skyrocketing costs of fringe benefits.³² They reported that the total cost of "fringes" in 1966 was estimated to be in excess of 66 billion dollars. This compares with 58.8 billion dollars in 1965. Ten years ago the cost totaled 29 billion dollars, and in 1947 "fringes" cost 10.5 billion dollars. "The end of the 'fringe binge' is not in sight" as unions keep thinking up new ways to spend the employers' money.³³

Mark H. Ingraham discusses a few dicta based on his study of fringe benefits entitled The Outer Fringe.³⁴ He discussed: (1) the need to custom fit benefit programs to local conditions; (2) the possibility that a poorly planned or implemented program may be worse than none; (3) the danger of angering people by program changes; and (4) the need for more thought concerning the underlying philosophy of benefit programs. He emphasized his feeling that "it is chiefly as benefits enrich the community

³²"Fringe Binge--It Costs More Every Year," U. S. News and World Report, 60 (May 2, 1966), pp. 76-8, 99.

³³Ibid., p. 99.

³⁴Mark H. Ingraham, "Other Benefits," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LI (March, 1965), pp. 26-29, discussing material from his book The Outer Fringe.

of scholars that they are useful to the institution and to education."³⁵
He illustrated by a sample list of items what a review of benefits might
find to question and perhaps to correct.

³⁵Ibid., p. 27.

CHAPTER III

THE NUMBER OF JUNIOR COLLEGES SURVEYED

AND A DESCRIPTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

Extent of the survey. A total of 300 public and private junior colleges were sent a nine-part questionnaire on fringe benefits. These schools were selected from the 1966 Junior College Directory in preparation for this study. There were 150 public junior colleges and 150 private and church-related junior colleges included in the mailing list. These were selected from the 1966 Junior College Directory to include at least one junior college from each of the fifty states of the Union. Sixteen states did not have both public and private junior colleges, therefore only one or the other was represented in the mailing list. Also, some states had only one junior college so it was not possible to include more than one college. Catholic junior colleges were excluded to eliminate any influence that the salary and fringe benefit practices for the religious faculty in these schools might have on the results. The intent in selecting these schools from the 1966 Junior College Directory was to survey a number of junior colleges from as broad a geographical range as possible from throughout the fifty United States.

Table II shows the number of public junior colleges which were surveyed and the number of responses used and the per cent that each group represented of the surveyed. Of the four public junior colleges which were excluded from the study, one was in the process of becoming a four-year institution and did not complete the questionnaire; one

TABLE II
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES SURVEYED AND NUMBER RESPONDING
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON FRINGE BENEFITS

Size of College	Number Surveyed	Per Cent of Total	Number of Respondents	Number of Respondents Used	Per Cent of Colleges Surveyed
0 - 1,000	59	39.3%	46	44	29.4%
1,001 - 2,000	38	25.3	32	32	21.3
2,001 - 5,000	34	22.7	32	30	20.0
Over 5,000	19	12.7	17	17	11.3
All Colleges	150	100.0%	127	123	82.0%

was from a school which was in its first year of operation and which was not the school to which the questionnaire had originally been sent; one indicated on the questionnaire that it was a private school, but the 1968 Junior College Directory still indicated that it was a public college; and one returned the questionnaire uncompleted with the explanation that they were "understaffed."

Of the 150 public junior colleges surveyed, 123, or 82.0 per cent, responded with usable replies. This represents a total of more than four of every five public junior colleges which were surveyed that responded to the questionnaire.

The junior colleges were asked to indicate the size of their student bodies. Four categories were used for the purposes of this study: 0 - 1,000; 1,001 - 2,000; 2,001 - 5,000; and over 5,000. This was done in order to make possible an analysis of the data according to the size of the colleges.

Table III shows the number of public junior colleges responding to the questionnaire, the number of respondents used, and the per cent that these represented of the total number of junior colleges surveyed.

Table IV presents a summary of the responses from the private junior colleges. Usable replies were received from ninety-nine, or 66.0 per cent, of the private junior colleges surveyed. The colleges were selected without reference to size or the number of students, and the number of colleges in the various size categories resulted from the natural distribution into which the colleges happened to fall. This was true for the public colleges as well as the private colleges.

TABLE III
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING
BY TYPE OF CONTROL

Type of College	Number Surveyed	Per Cent of Total	Number of Respondents	Number of Respondents Used	Per cent of Colleges Surveyed
State	57	38.0%	52	52	34.7%
Community	93	62.0	75	71	47.3
All Colleges	150	100.0%	127	123	82.0%

The response from the private junior colleges of approximately two out of every three schools surveyed, was lower than the response from the public schools. Of the nine responses from the private junior colleges which were not used, one was from a school which discontinued its academic program at the end of 1967, and the other eight were from schools which are now four-year institutions or are in the process of transition. There were eighty private junior colleges and seventy church-related junior colleges in the survey, as revealed in Table V, and the percentage of responses from the private junior colleges was higher than for the church-related junior colleges.

The 123 public junior colleges responding to the survey reported total faculty of 12,130, while the 99 private junior colleges reported a total of 4,184 faculty members. Eighty-six of the private junior colleges, however, reported student bodies of less than 1,000 students, while only forty-four of the public junior colleges reported student bodies of less than 1,000 students. Seventeen of the public junior colleges had more than 5,000 students so that on the average there were more faculty members per college in the public junior colleges.

Description of the questionnaire. The questionnaire included nine sections of questions concerning nine possible fringe benefit programs. These were: (1) Retirement, (2) Insurance, (3) Tenure, (4) Sabbatical leaves, (5) Faculty Travel Expense, (6) Faculty Housing, (7) Faculty Family Education, (8) Mortgage Loans, and (9) Personal Loans. The questions in each section were designed to cover certain key factors concerning the fringe benefit program and the provisions thereof in each

TABLE IV
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES SURVEYED AND NUMBER RESPONDING
TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE ON FRINGE BENEFITS

Size of College	Number Surveyed	Per Cent of Total	Number of Respondents	Number of Respondents Used	Per Cent of Colleges Surveyed
0 - 1,000	128	85.4%	93	86	57.3%
1,001 - 2,000	14	9.3	10	9	6.0
2,001 - 5,000	8	5.3	5	4	2.7
Over 5,000					
All Colleges	150	100.0%	108	99	66.0%

TABLE V
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES RESPONDING
BY TYPE OF CONTROL

Type of Control	Number Surveyed	Per cent of Total	Number of Respondents	Number of Respondents Used	Per cent of Colleges Surveyed
Private	80	53.3%	61	56	37.3%
Church Related	70	46.7	47	43	28.7
All Colleges	150	100.0%	108	99	66.0%

institution. In additon, the respondent was asked to indicate his impressions of the effectiveness of the program for recruiting and retaining faculty, in accordance with a rating scale given at the beginning of the questionnaire. Only those institutions which provided a given fringe benefit program were asked to complete this evaluation. In some instances the evaluations were completed by institutions which did not provide the programs being evaluated, but these were not included in the tabulation of the results.

In the section on Faculty Family Education, the public junior colleges in California were omitted because there is no tuition charge in the state colleges there, and most of the California colleges gave no answers or evaluations for this section.

An attempt was made in this study to develop a profile of the importance of each of these nine fringe benefit programs for recruiting and retaining faculty. The data was tabulated separately for the public and private institutions, and then a combined summary of the results of each section was prepared.

A copy of the questionnaire is included in the appendix of this thesis.

CHAPTER IV

RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Public Junior Colleges. The replies to the section on retirement programs revealed that almost nine out of ten junior colleges in the survey provided a retirement plan for their faculty. The data on public junior colleges, presented in Table VI, reveals that 87.8 per cent provided some kind of retirement program. This ranged as high as 96.8 per cent for the schools in the 2,001 to 5,000 students group.

The percentage of the public junior colleges paying at least a portion of the premium for the retirement program was 81.5 per cent, as shown in Table VII. The percentages ranged from 72.4 per cent for the colleges in the 1,001 to 2,000 students group, to 86.2 per cent in the 2,001 to 5,000 students group. A total of 88 out of 108 colleges paid a part or all of the retirement program premium. The high percentage of contributory plans would seem to suggest a high degree of preference for a plan in which both the college and the employee share the cost of the plan.

The evaluation of the retirement programs by the public junior college was in terms of the contribution which it was felt the plan made to recruiting and retaining faculty members. The data in Table VIII shows the number of times the retirement program was rated as superior, good, average, poor, or very poor, according to the scale given in the questionnaire. A total of forty-four of the colleges rated the retirement program as good, and, close behind, thirty-four colleges rated the retirement program as superior. This translates into 40.7 per cent

TABLE VI
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Retirement Plan	Per Cent Providing Retirement Plan
0 - 1,000	44	34	77.3%
1,001 - 2,000	32	29	90.6
2,001 - 5,000	30	29	96.8
Over 5,000	17	16	94.1
All Colleges	123	108	87.8

TABLE VII
PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES PAYING AT LEAST
A PORTION OF THE RETIREMENT PREMIUM

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number Paying a Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying a Portion of Premium
0 - 1,000	34	29	85.3%
1,001 - 2,000	29	21	72.4
2,001 - 5,000	29	25	86.2
Over 5,000	16	13	81.3
All Colleges	108	88	81.5%

TABLE VIII

EVALUATION OF RETIREMENT PROGRAMS BY
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	34	8	12	9	5		
1,001 - 2,000	29	9	9	6	3	1	1
2,001 - 5,000	29	9	17	1	1		1
Over 5,000	16	8	6	2			
All Colleges	108	34	44	18	9	1	2
Per Cent	100.0%	31.5%	40.7%	16.7%	8.3%	0.9%	1.9%

rating the program as good, and 31.5 per cent rating the program as superior, or a total of 71.2 per cent rating the program in the top two categories.

One of the public junior colleges added, in elaboration of its evaluation, that the value of the retirement program depends upon the age of the faculty member. It is not of much value to the young person under thirty, but is superior for the person in the forty to sixty age bracket. A junior college in Iowa explained its very poor rating by stating that "all public schools are under the same plan by law." Therefore, there was no recruiting advantage within the state.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges ranked only 1.0 per cent higher in the percentage of colleges providing a retirement program. Of the ninety-nine private junior colleges responding to the survey, eighty-eight, or 88.8 per cent, provided some form of retirement program. Table IX shows the data on the private junior colleges providing retirement programs.

Although the public schools and the private schools ranked very closely in the percentages providing retirement programs, the private schools showed a higher percentage paying part or all of the premium. While only 81.5 per cent of the public schools paid some portion of the premium, a total of 97.7 per cent of the private schools paid some portion of the premium, as revealed in Table X.

The fact that a much higher percentage of the private schools pay some portion of the premium does not seem to be reflected in any significant increase in the ratings given to the retirement program by the private schools. Table XI shows that while 53.4 per cent of the

TABLE IX
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING RETIREMENT PROGRAMS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Retirement Plan	Per Cent Providing Retirement Plan
0 - 1,000	86	75	87.2%
1,001 - 2,000	9	9	100.0
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	88	88.8%

TABLE X

PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PAYING AT LEAST
A PORTION OF THE RETIREMENT PREMIUM

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number Paying a Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying a Portion of Premium
0 - 1,000	75	73	97.3%
1,001 - 2,000	9	9	100.0
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	88	86	97.7%

TABLE XI
EVALUATION OF RETIREMENT PROGRAMS
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	75	16	41	15	3	
1,001 - 2,000	9	3	5	1		
2,001 - 5,000	4	3	1			
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	88	22	47	16	3	
Per Cent	100.0%	25.0%	53.4%	18.2%	3.4%	

private schools rated the program as good compared with 40.7 per cent for the public schools, only 25.0 per cent of the private schools rated the program as superior compared with 31.5 per cent for the public schools. Overall, 78.4 per cent of the private schools rated the retirement programs as good or superior, compared to 72.2 per cent of the public schools.

CHAPTER V

INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Public Junior Colleges. Of the 123 public junior colleges, ninety-six, or 78.0 per cent, provided group life insurance programs. As Table XII shows, the percentage of public schools providing group health insurance programs ranged from 68.2 per cent for the small schools to 94.1 per cent for the schools having more than 5,000 students. The jump in the percentage providing group health programs was especially significant between the schools with 2,000 or fewer students and those with more than 2,000 students. The schools having 2,000 or fewer students registered from 68.2 to 68.8 per cent providing group health insurance, but the schools having more than 2,000 students registered from 93.3 to 94.1 per cent providing this program.

The range in the percentage of public schools providing life insurance programs was from 38.6 to 53.3 per cent. Although the spread between the smaller schools and the larger schools was not as great as in the group health programs, the larger schools, having more than 2,000 students were separated by only .4 of a per cent.

Table XIII shows the number and percentage of public junior colleges paying at least a portion of the cost of the group health and group life insurance premiums. Approximately eight out of ten public schools, or 79.2 per cent, pay at least a portion of the group health insurance premium, and 82.5 per cent pay at least a portion of the group life insurance premium.

In the evaluation by the public junior colleges, shown in Table XIV,

TABLE XII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Group Health Insurance	Per Cent Providing Group Health Insurance	Number Providing Group Life Insurance	Per Cent Providing Group Life Insurance
0 - 1,000	44	30	68.2%	17	38.6%
1,001 - 2,000	32	22	68.8	15	46.9
2,001 - 5,000	30	28	93.3	16	53.3
Over 5,000	17	16	94.1	9	52.9
All Colleges	123	96	78.0%	57	46.3%

TABLE XIII

PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES PAYING AT LEAST A PORTION
OF THE GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Size of College	Number of Group Health Programs	Number Paying Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying Portion of Premium	Number of Group Life Programs	Number Paying Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying Portion of Premium
0 - 1,000	30	19	63.3%	17	13	76.5%
1,001 - 2,000	22	17	77.3	15	13	86.7
2,001 - 5,000	28	27	96.4	16	13	81.3
Over 5,000	16	15	93.8	9	8	88.9
All Colleges	96	78	79.2%	57	47	82.5%

TABLE XIV
EVALUATION OF GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	30	7	13	8	2		
1,001 - 2,000	22	10	5	6			1
2,001 - 5,000	28	10	9	7	2		
Over 5,000	16	9	4	3			
All Colleges	96	36	31	24	4		1
Per Cent	100.0%	37.5%	32.3%	25.0%	4.2%		1.0%

37.5 per cent rated the group health and life insurance programs superior, 32.3 per cent good, 25.0 per cent average, 4.2 per cent poor, and 1.0 per cent made no evaluation.

Private Junior Colleges. The responses of the private junior colleges, shown in Table XV, show that 89.9 per cent of the responding schools provided group health insurance, and 65.7 per cent provided group life insurance.

The private junior colleges reported a higher percentage paying a portion of the premiums for group health and life insurance programs. As reflected in Table XVI, 92.1 per cent of the private junior colleges pay a portion of the group health insurance premium, and 96.9 per cent pay a portion of the group life insurance premium. This compares with 79.2 per cent and 82.5 per cent respectively for the public junior colleges. The higher percentage of private junior colleges paying a portion of the insurance premiums parallels the relationship that was found to exist between the public and the private colleges in regard to their retirement programs.

The evaluation of the group health and life insurance programs by the private junior colleges, shows a somewhat higher rating of these programs in terms of their contribution to recruiting and retaining faculty than was given by the public junior colleges. Table XVII shows that 38.7 per cent rated the programs superior, 40.9 per cent good, 17.2 per cent average, and 3.2 per cent poor. A total of 79.6 per cent rated the programs in the two top categories as compared with 69.8 per cent of the public junior colleges rating the programs this high.

One of the public junior colleges in Michigan rated their insurance

TABLE XV
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Group Health Insurance	Per Cent Providing Group Health Programs	Number Providing Group Life Insurance	Per Cent Providing Group Life Insurance
0 - 1,000	86	76	88.4%	53	61.6%
1,001 - 2,000	9	9	100.0	7	77.8
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0	4	100.0
over 5,000					
All Colleges	99	89	89.9%	64	64.6%

TABLE XVI
PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PAYING AT LEAST A PORTION
OF THE GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PREMIUMS

Size of College	Number of Group Health Programs	Number Paying Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying Portion of Premium	Number of Group Life Programs	Number Paying Portion of Premium	Per Cent Paying Portion of Premium
0 - 1,000	76	69	90.8%	53	51	96.2%
1,001 - 2,000	9	9	100.0	7	7	100.0
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0	4	4	100.0
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	89	82	92.1%	64	62	96.9%

TABLE XVII
EVALUATION OF GROUP HEALTH AND LIFE INSURANCE PROGRAMS
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	80	27	34	16	3	
1,001 - 2,000	9	7	2			
2,001 - 5,000	4	2	2			
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	93*	36	38	16	3	
Per Cent	100.0%	38.7%	40.9%	17.2%	3.2%	

*This number is greater than the number of private junior colleges providing wither group health or group life insurance because some provided one program but not the other so that the total number providing one program or the other was greater than the total in each category, as shown in Table XV.

programs superior with regard to the group health program, and poor with regard to the group life insurance program. An Illinois community junior college gave a similar response, rating the group health insurance program good, and the group life insurance program poor. The lower frequency with which group life insurance programs were provided by both public and private junior colleges would seem to indicate that a relatively lessor degree of importance was attached to the group life insurance program.

CHAPTER VI

TENURE

Public Junior Colleges. Provisions for tenure programs were found to vary widely from state to state among the public junior colleges. Some states, such as Michigan, have mandatory requirements for tenure programs; Iowa has a continuing contract law; and California requires tenure at the end of three years service. Considerable variation also exists in the requirements for eligibility for appointment to tenure. Academic rank, degrees held, years of service, and quality of performance as judged by superiors and boards of trustees, were found to be the most frequently used and emphasized considerations in the determination of eligibility for tenure. In some cases, where state laws did not already cover the matter, tenure was considered automatic by institutional policy after the completion of a specified number of years of service. In some colleges the faculty members are evaluated very closely during a "probationary" period of a specified number of years at the end of which tenure is granted if the conditions are satisfactorily met by the faculty member.

An analysis of the number of public junior colleges providing tenure programs is presented in Table XVIII. The colleges with 1,000 or fewer students provided tenure programs in 61.4 per cent of the junior colleges responding to the survey. In the schools having from 1,001 to 2,000 students, 62.5 per cent provided tenure programs. However, a pronounced increase in this percentage was found in the colleges with more than 2,000 students. A total of 90.0 per cent of the colleges with from

TABLE XVIII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING A PROGRAM OF TENURE

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Tenure Program	Per Cent Providing Tenure Program
0 - 1,000	44	27	61.4%
1,001 - 2,000	32	20	62.5
2,001 - 5,000	30	27	90.0
Over 5,000	17	15	88.2
All Colleges	123	89	72.4%

2,001 to 5,000 students, provided tenure programs; and 88.2 per cent of the colleges with more than 5,000 students provided tenure programs. Overall, 72.4 per cent of the public junior colleges provided tenure programs.

A summary of the number of years of service required by public junior colleges for eligibility for tenure is shown in Table XIX. Three years of service is required by fifty-four, or 60.7 per cent, of the colleges responding. A total of 22.5 per cent of the colleges indicated that they required fewer than three years, and 16.8 per cent reported that they required more than three years. One college indicated that no years of service were required before eligibility for tenure; and another college listed a requirement of nine years, the highest number of years reported by any of the public junior colleges. This data gives a mode of three years, a mean of 3.1 years, and a median of 2.8 years, indicating a nearly normal curve for the colleges in this survey, but a curve which is skewed slightly to the right. This would tend to be expected with a few colleges having high years-of-service requirements.

The evaluation of the tenure programs by the public junior colleges, for recruiting and retaining faculty, showed that 30, or 33.7 per cent, rated this program as superior; and 42, or 47.2 per cent, rated it as good. Only 17, or 19.1 per cent, rated the tenure program as average or lower. Table XX presents the evaluations by the public junior colleges.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges seemed to vary about as widely as the public junior colleges in their provisions and requirements for tenure, although without the obvious statewide patterns of the public colleges. Degrees earned and rank attained were the most

TABLE XIX
NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number of Years							
		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven Eight Nine
0 - 1,000	27		1	5	17	2	1		1
1,001 - 2,000	20	1		5	7	3	1	2	1
2,001 - 5,000	27		1	5	18		3		
Over 5,000	15			2	12	1			
All Colleges	89	1	2	17	54	6	5	2	1 1
Per Cent	100.0%	1.1%	2.3%	19.1%	60.7%	6.7%	5.6%	2.3%	1.1% 1.1%

TABLE XX
EVALUATION OF THE TENURE PROGRAM
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	27	5	15	6	1	
1,001 - 2,000	20	7	9	3	1	
2,001 - 5,000	27	10	13	3	1	
Over 5,000	15	8	5	2		
All Colleges	89	30	42	14	3	
Per Cent	100.0%	33.7%	47.2%	15.7%	3.4%	

frequently mentioned criteria for eligibility for tenure by the private junior colleges.

Private Junior Colleges. The percentage of private junior colleges providing tenure programs, presented in Table XXI, is somewhat lower than the percentage for their public counterparts. However, for the colleges with 1,000 or fewer students, the percentages are almost identical: 61.6 per cent for the private junior colleges, and 61.4 per cent for the public junior colleges. The percentages vary several points for the colleges having from 1,001 to 2,000 students, and from 2,001 to 5,000 students. Since there were no private colleges in the survey which reported more than 5,000 students, there were no percentages for comparison in this size category. The overall percentage for the public junior colleges was 72.4 per cent, and 63.6 per cent for the private junior colleges.

The higher percentage of public junior colleges providing tenure programs is due to the very high percentage of the larger junior colleges which are providing this program. Since there were no private junior colleges reporting student bodies of more than 5,000 students, and since there were very few private junior colleges responding to this survey in the 1,001 to 2,000 and 2,001 to 5,000 students categories, this would appear to account for their lower overall percentage, shown in Table XXII.

Of the sixty-three private junior colleges providing tenure programs, twenty-five, or 39.7 per cent, require three years of service for eligibility. Of the remaining thirty-eight colleges, six, or 9.5 per cent, require less than three years; and thirty-two, or 50.8 per cent, require more than three years of service for eligibility for tenure. The mode for

TABLE XXI
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING A PROGRAM OF TENURE

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Tenure Program	Per Cent Providing Tenure Program
0 - 1,000	86	53	61.6%
1,001 - 2,000	9	7	77.8
2,001 - 5,000	4	3	75.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	63	63.6%

TABLE XXII
NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR TENURE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number of Years								
		None	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight
0 - 1,000	53	2	2	2	22	4	9	4	7	1
1,001 - 2,000	7				2	1	4			
2,001 - 5,000	3				1		1		1	
Over 5,000										
All Colleges	63	2	2	2	25	5	14	4	8	1
Per Cent	100.0%	3.2%	3.2%	3.2%	39.7%	7.9%	22.2%	6.3%	12.7%	1.6%

the private junior colleges is three years, the mean is 4.1 years, and the median is 4.6 years. The mean number of years required for eligibility for tenure is one year higher for the private junior colleges than for the public junior colleges

Although three years of service was the number of years most frequently reported by the private junior colleges, fourteen, or 22.2 per cent of the sixty-three colleges required five years of service, and eight, or 12.7 per cent, required seven years. The distribution of the data for the private colleges results in a tri-modal curve, having three peaks: at three years, five years, and seven years, decreasing somewhat with the increasing number of years. The private junior colleges in this survey tend towards longer service requirements in a higher percentage of the colleges than the public colleges. A total of 50.8 per cent of the private junior colleges require more than three years of service, but only 16.8 per cent of the public junior colleges require more than three years of service.

The private junior colleges gave a rating of superior to the tenure program in 14.9 per cent of the colleges, and a rating of good in 63.5 per cent of the colleges. The remainder, 22.2 per cent, rated the tenure program average or lower. They rated the tenure program as superior in a smaller percentage of the colleges, and good in a higher percentage of the colleges than did the public junior colleges, thus resulting in a lower overall rating. This would tend to indicate that the public junior colleges consider the tenure program of more importance in recruiting and retaining faculty than do the private junior colleges. Table XXIII

below present the data on the evaluation of the tenure program by the private junior colleges.

TABLE XXIII
EVALUATION OF THE TENURE PROGRAM
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	53	5	35	11	2	
1,001 - 2,000	7	3	3	1		
2,001 - 5,000	3	1	2			
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	63	9	40	12	2	
Percentages	100.0%	14.9%	63.5%	19.0%	3.2%	

CHAPTER VII

SABBATICAL LEAVES

Public Junior Colleges. The survey of sabbatical leave programs revealed that a little over half of the public junior colleges provided some sabbatical leave program for their faculty. As Table XXIV reveals, the percentage of colleges providing this program increased with the size of the colleges. As with the programs previously discussed, the schools with 2,000 or fewer students had a substantially smaller percentage of participation in this program than did the schools with more than 2,000 students. The range was from 43.2 to 43.8 per cent participation for the smaller colleges, and 80.0 to 82.4 per cent for the larger colleges. Overall, 57.7 per cent of the state and community junior colleges in this survey provide a sabbatical leave program.

The number of years required by the public junior colleges for eligibility for a sabbatical leave varied from two years to as many as fourteen years in one college, with two colleges indicating no policy for any specific number of years of service. Seven years was required by thirty-six colleges out of the seventy-one providing this program; and the second most frequently required number of years was six, required by sixteen of the seventy-one colleges. Table XXV shows the distribution of the years-of-service requirements of the seventy-one public junior colleges which provided this program.

The public junior colleges required tenure as a condition for eligibility for a sabbatical leave in fifty-four, or 76.1 per cent, of the seventy-one colleges, as shown in Table XXVI. The lowest percentage among the public colleges in this survey was 57.1 per cent in the colleges

TABLE XXIV
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING PROGRAMS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Sabbatical Leave Programs	Per Cent Providing Sabbatical Leave Programs
0 - 1,000	44	19	43.2%
1,001 - 2,000	32	14	43.8
2,001 - 5,000	30	24	80.0
Over 5,000	17	14	82.4
All Colleges	123	71	57.7%

TABLE XXV
NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR FIRST SABBATICAL LEAVE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Years of Service Required									
		Not Specified	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	Ten Nine or More
0 - 1,000	19			2	2	1	4	4	5		1
1,001 - 2,000	14	1			2	1	1	4	5		
2,001 - 5,000	24						1	4	17		2*
Over 5,000	14	1						4	9		
All Colleges	71	2		2	4	2	6	16	36		3

*One college requires fourteen years of service.

TABLE XXVI

NUMBER OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES REQUIRING TENURE AS A
CONDITION FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number Requiring Tenure	Per Cent Requiring Tenure
0 - 1,000	19	13	68.4%
1,001 - 2,000	14	8	57.1
2,001 - 5,000	24	20	83.3
Over 5,000	14	13	92.9
All Colleges	71	54	76.1%

having from 1,001 to 2,000 students.

The years-of-service requirements of the public junior colleges for eligibility for a second sabbatical leave are presented in Table XXVII. The pattern of requirements is very similar to that for eligibility for the first sabbatical leave. Thirty-six of the colleges required seven years for the second sabbatical leave, exactly the same number that required seven years for the first sabbatical leave. Thirteen colleges required six years of service for the second sabbatical leave, and twelve required from one to five years. Of the remaining ten colleges six required no specified number of years, and four colleges did not permit a second sabbatical.

The evaluation of the sabbatical leave program by the public junior colleges is shown in Table XXVIII. Of the seventy-one colleges providing the program, twenty rated it superior, thirty-one rated it good, sixteen rated it average, and four rated it poor. None rated it very poor.

Private Junior Colleges. The survey of sabbatical leave programs in private junior colleges revealed a slightly lower overall participation in this program by the private colleges in this survey. Table XXIX shows a total of 47.5 per cent of the private junior colleges in this survey provide sabbatical leave programs. The small junior colleges having less than 1,000 students had a total of forty colleges, or 46.5 per cent, providing this program; and the colleges having from 1,001 to 2,000 students had five colleges, or 55.6 per cent, providing this program. Only two of the four colleges having from 2,001 to 5,000 students provided for sabbatical leaves. Only one more school offering this program would have raised the percentage to 75 per cent; therefore, the small number of private junior colleges in the survey with more than 2,000

TABLE XXVII

NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR SECOND SABBATICAL LEAVE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Years of Service Required									
		Not Specified	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	No Second Leave
0 - 1,000	19	1		4	1		2	4	6		1
1,001 - 2,000	14	3	1	1			1	3	4		1
2,001 - 5,000	24	2					2	2	17		1
Over 5,000	14							4	9		1
All Colleges	71	6	1	5	1		5	13	36		4

TABLE XXVIII
EVALUATION OF THE SABBATICAL LEAVE PROGRAM
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	19	2	10	7		
1,001 - 2,000	14	3	7	2	2	
2,001 - 5,000	24	8	9	6	1	
Over 5,000	14	7	5	1	1	
All Colleges	71	20	31	16	4	
Per Cent	100.0%	28.2%	43.7%	22.5%	5.6%	

TABLE XXIX
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING PROGRAMS FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Sabbatical Leave Programs	Per Cent Providing Sabbatical Leave Programs
0 - 1,000	86	40	46.5%
1,001 - 2,000	9	5	55.6
2,001 - 5,000	4	2	50.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	47	47.5%

students makes the percentage in these categories much less significant in making any comparison with the public junior colleges, but the responses received do not indicate any significant differences between the public and private junior colleges in the number and percentage of the schools providing sabbatical leave programs.

The data on the years of service required by the private junior colleges for eligibility for a sabbatical leave show that six years is required by eleven of the forty-seven colleges, followed closely by seven years which is required by ten of the colleges. The remaining twenty-six colleges have requirements ranging from no specified number of years to as many as ten years, as shown in Table XXX.

Tenure was required as a condition for eligibility by 38.3 per cent of the private junior colleges. This was substantially lower than the total of 76.1 per cent of the public junior colleges which required tenure as a condition for sabbatical leaves. The data in Table XXXI tends to suggest a much greater readiness on the part of the private colleges to grant a sabbatical leave to faculty members who do not yet have tenure, especially since the percentages of public and private colleges having tenure programs was not substantially different. What has been obtained here, however, is an indication only of the number and percentage of junior colleges requiring tenure as a condition for eligibility for sabbatical leaves. In the case of the private junior colleges, it may very well be that the percentage of faculty members receiving sabbatical leaves and who also have tenure, is greater than the percentage of colleges actually requiring tenure as a matter of policy. The absence of statewide laws requiring tenure may also be a

TABLE XXX
NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR FIRST SABBATICAL LEAVE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Years of Service Required									
		Not Specified	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	Nine Ten
0 - 1,000	40	3*	2	2	2	3	2	11	8	1	6
1,001 - 2,000	5	1			1		1		2		
2,001 - 5,000	2				1		1				
Over 5,000											
All Colleges	47	4	2	2	4	3	4	11	10	1	6

*One college stated a requirement of 0 to 8 years.

TABLE XXXI

NUMBER OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES REQUIRING TENURE AS A
CONDITION FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR SABBATICAL LEAVES

Size of College	Number of Programs	Number Requiring Tenure	Per Cent Requiring Tenure
0 - 1,000	40	14	35.0%
1,001 - 2,000	5	3	60.0
2,001 - 5,000	2	1	50.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	47	18	38.3%

factor in the lower percentage of private junior colleges requiring tenure as a condition for sabbatical leaves.

The number of years of service required by the private junior colleges for a second sabbatical leave is shown in Table XXXII. The table shows that six years of service is the most common requirement for the second sabbatical, with seven years of service being the second most commonly required period of service. This is just the reverse of the public junior colleges in which seven years of service was far more commonly required than six years, with six years being the second most common requirement. Of the forty-seven private junior colleges, eleven had no specified number of years of service as a requirement for a second sabbatical leave, and two colleges did not permit a second sabbatical leave.

In their evaluation of the sabbatical leave program, shown in Table XXXIII, nine of the forty-seven private junior colleges rated the program as superior, twenty-three rated it good, thirteen rated it average, one rated it poor, and one gave no evaluation. A total of thirty-one or 68.1 per cent rated the program in the top two categories of superior and good. This was just slightly under the 71.9 per cent of the public junior colleges which rated the sabbatical leave program this high.

TABLE XXXII

NUMBER OF YEARS OF SERVICE REQUIRED BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
FOR ELIGIBILITY FOR SECOND SABBATICAL LEAVE

Size of College	Number of Programs	Years of Service Required										No Second Leave
		Not Specified	One	Two	Three	Four	Five	Six	Seven	Eight	Nine	
0 - 1,000	40	10			3	1	1	11	7		5	2
1,001 - 2,000	5	1					1	1	2			
2,001 - 5,000	2	1						1				
Over 5,000												
All Colleges	47	12			3	1	2	13	9		5	2

TABLE XXXIII

EVALUATION OF THE SABBATICAL LEAVE PROGRAM BY
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	40	8	18	12	1		1
1,001 - 2,000	5		4	1			
2,001 - 5,000	2	1	1				
Over 5,000							
All Colleges	47	9	23	13	1		1
Per cent	100.0%	19.2%	48.9%	27.7%	2.1%		2.1%

CHAPTER VIII

FACULTY TRAVEL

Public Junior Colleges. The number and percentage of public junior colleges indicating that they placed some specific limitations on faculty travel varied considerably from one size category to the next. The per cent ranged from a low of 31.3 per cent for the colleges in the 1,001 to 2,000 students category, to 66.7 per cent in the 2,001 to 5,000 students category. Overall, as shown in the Table XXXIV, the per cent setting some specific policy on faculty travel was 46.3 per cent.

Table XXXV presents the data on the formulas used by the public junior colleges for reimbursement of travel expense. In some cases more than one answer was given so that the total responses, as shown in the table, exceed the number of colleges responding to the survey. A total of 127 answers were given in response from 123 colleges. Of these, two colleges listed "actual cost" as the basis for reimbursement, 115 listed "rate-per-mile," seventeen listed "other" formulas, and two colleges gave no answer. A total of 93.5 per cent of the colleges use the "rate-per-mile" formula for reimbursement of travel expenses.

The data from the state and community junior colleges in Table XXXVI, indicates that the payment of moving expenses by the public junior colleges is done by very few institutions. Only eight, or 6.5 per cent of the public junior colleges indicated that any reimbursement was ever made to new faculty members for moving expenses. The responses for these schools indicated that any reimbursement was ever made to new faculty members for moving expenses. The responses for these schools indicated that this was

TABLE XXXIV
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES HAVING
SPECIFIED LIMITS ON FACULTY TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Having Specified Limits on Travel Reimbursement	Per Cent Having Specified Limits on Travel Reimbursement
0 - 1,000	44	18	40.9%
1,001 - 2,000	32	10	31.3
2,001 - 5,000	30	20	66.7
Over 5,000	17	9	52.9
All Colleges	123	57	46.3%

TABLE XXXV

FORMULA FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Total Responses	Actual Cost	Formula		
				Rate Per Mile	Other	None Given
0 - 1,000	44	45*		42	2	1
1,001 - 2,000	32	32		30	1	1
2,001 - 5,000	30	30	1	27	2	
Over 5,000	17	20*	1	16	3	
All Colleges	123	127*	2	115	8	2

*Some colleges indicated that more than one formula was used, depending on the circumstances.

TABLE XXXVI
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
PAYING A PORTION OR ALL OF THE MOVING
EXPENSES FOR NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Paying a Portion or All of Moving Expense	Per Cent Paying a Portion or All of Moving Expense
0 - 1,000	44	1	2.3%
1,001 - 2,000	32	3	9.4
2,001 - 5,000	30	2	6.7
Over 5,000	17	2	11.8
All Colleges	123	8	6.5%

often a discretionary matter and depended upon the circumstances in each situation.

The evaluation of the faculty travel program by the public junior colleges appears to indicate a lower rating for this program by the colleges responding. As shown in Table XXXVII, only 9.8 per cent of the colleges gave this program a superior rating. However, 45.5 per cent rated it good. It received a rating of average by 31.7 per cent, a rating of poor by 6.5 per cent, and a rating of very poor by 2.4 per cent. A total of 4.1 per cent gave no evaluation of the faculty travel program.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges appear to have specific policies for faculty travel in a higher percentage of the colleges, than do the state and community junior colleges. A total of 57.6 per cent of them, fifty-seven out of the ninety-nine private colleges responding, have specified limits on faculty travel. This is a difference of 11.3 per cent more than the public colleges. Table XXXVIII shows the data for the number and per cent of private junior colleges having specified limits on faculty travel.

The formula used by the private junior colleges for reimbursement of travel expense is based on a rate per mile in 90.9 per cent of the colleges. Table XXXIX shows that ninety out of the ninety-nine colleges responding use the rate-per-mile formula, four colleges use some "other" formula, and five colleges gave no answer to this question. None of the private colleges listed "actual cost" as a formula for reimbursement.

The private junior colleges pay some portion of the moving expenses in 47.5 per cent of the colleges. Table XL shows that forty-seven out of the ninety private colleges pay some portion of moving expenses. This is

TABLE XXXVII

EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY TRAVEL PROGRAM BY
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	44	2	19	15	5	1	2
1,001 - 2,000	32	2	15	11	1	2	1
2,001 - 5,000	30	7	13	10			
Over 5,000	17	1	9	3	2		2
All Colleges	123	12	56	39	8	3	5
Per cent	100.0%	9.8%	45.5%	31.7%	6.5%	2.4%	4.1%

TABLE XXXVIII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES HAVING
SPECIFIED LIMITS ON FACULTY TRAVEL REIMBURSEMENT

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Having Specified Limits on Travel Reimbursement	Per Cent Having Specified Limits on Travel Reimbursement
0 - 1,000	86	47	54.6%
1,001 - 2,000	9	6	66.7
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	57	57.6%

TABLE XXXIX

FORMULA FOR REIMBURSEMENT OF TRAVEL EXPENSE
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Total Responses	Formula		
			Actual Cost	Rate Per Mile	Other Given
0 - 1,000	86	86		78	4
1,001 - 2,000	9	9		8	1
2,001 - 5,000	4	4		4	
Over 5,000					
All Colleges	99	99		90	4 5

TABLE XL

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
 PAYING A PORTION OR ALL OF THE MOVING
 EXPENSE FOR NEW FACULTY MEMBERS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Paying a Portion or All of Moving Expense	Per Cent Paying a Portion or All of Moving Expense
0 - 1,000	86	42	48.8%
1,001 - 2,000	9	4	44.4
2,001 - 5,000	4	1	25.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	47	47.5%

substantially higher than the 6.5 per cent of the public junior colleges which pay some portion of moving expenses. The data in this table appears to indicate that the private colleges rely on the payment of moving expenses as a recruiting benefit much more so than the public schools.

However, despite the indication by the private junior colleges that they pay moving expense much more frequently than the public junior colleges, they do not rate the overall program by faculty travel quite as high as do the public junior colleges. In the evaluation by the private junior colleges, they rate the program superior in 11.1 per cent of the colleges, good in 39.4 per cent of the colleges, average in 40.4 per cent of the colleges, poor in 8.1 per cent of the colleges, and 1.0 per cent gave no evaluation. A total of 50.5 per cent rated the program superior or good as compared with 55.3 per cent for the public junior colleges. The evaluation of the sabbatical-leave program by the private junior colleges is presented in Table XLI.

TABLE XLI

EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY TRAVEL PROGRAM BY
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	86	8	35	34	8		1
1,001 - 2,000	9	1	4	4			
2,001 - 5,000	4	2		2			
Over 5,000							
All Colleges	99	11	39	40	8		1
Per cent	100.0%	11.1%	39.4%	40.4%	8.1%		1.0%

CHAPTER IX

FACULTY HOUSING

Public Junior Colleges. College-owned housing was found to be almost a rarity among the public junior colleges. Certainly, it was the exception rather than the rule. As Table XLII shows, only 8.1 per cent of the public junior colleges had college-owned housing. This percentage was highest, 15.9 per cent, for the colleges in the 0 - 1,000 students category; and dropped to no college-owned housing among the colleges which had more than 5,000 students. These findings apply, of course, only to the 123 colleges responding to this survey with usable data; but they do indicate very limited involvement in college-owned housing among public junior colleges, especially the larger ones.

Among the public junior colleges having college-owned housing, 90.0 per cent indicated that some form of priority system was used in making the assignment of housing. The colleges were asked whether their priority system was based on service, rank, need, or some other factor. Several of the colleges indicated that more than one of these listed factors was taken into consideration in the priority system. Service was listed seven times, rank two times, and need six times, by the ten public junior colleges having college-owned housing. Length of service and need appeared to be about equally emphasized in the priority systems of these colleges, as shown in Table XLIII.

Of the ten public junior colleges providing college-owned housing, four indicated that this housing was furnished in lieu of other compensation, as presented in Table XLIV.

TABLE XLII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
HAVING COLLEGE-OWNED HOUSING

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Having College-Owned Housing	Per Cent Having College-Owned Housing
0 - 1,000	14	7	15.9%
1,001 - 2,000	32	2	6.3
2,001 - 5,000	30	1	3.3
Over 5,000	17		
All Colleges	123	10	8.1%

TABLE XLIII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES USING A PRIORITY
SYSTEM IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF HOUSING AND THE TYPE OF
PRIORITY SYSTEM USED

Size of College	Number Having Housing	Number Having Priority System	Per Cent Having Priority System	Type of Priority System		
				Length of Service	Rank	Need Other
C - 1,000	7	6	85.7%	5	1	3
1,001 - 2,000	2	2	100.0	2	1	2
2,001 - 5,000	1	1	100.0			1
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	10	9	90.0%	7	2	6

TABLE XLIV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING HOUSING IN LIEU OF COMPENSATION

Size of College	Number Having Housing	Number Furnishing Housing in Lieu of Compensation	Per Cent Furnishing Housing in Lieu of Compensation
0 - 1,000	7	3	42.9%
1,001 - 2,000	2	1	50.0
2,001 - 5,000	1		
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	10	4	40.0%

The evaluation of the faculty housing program by the public junior colleges shows a relatively lower rating for this program. Table XLV shows 10.0 per cent of the colleges rating it superior, 20.0 per cent rating it good, 50.0 per cent rating it average, and 20.0 per cent rating it poor. Thus, only 30.0 per cent rated the program in the top two categories of superior and good which is considerably below most of the other programs in this survey.

Private Junior Colleges. Among the private junior colleges in this survey, college-owned housing was found to be a much more prevalent practice than among the public junior colleges. Table XLVI shows that 65.1 per cent of the private colleges in this survey had college-owned housing. Although the per cent appeared to decline with the larger institutions, the overall percentage is about eight times as great as for the public junior colleges. A total of sixty-five out of ninety-nine of these junior colleges had college-owned housing.

In Table XLVII, which shows the number and per cent of private junior colleges providing a priority system for the assignment of housing, the data shows that a total of 53.8 per cent of the private junior colleges use some priority system. The table shows that the thirty-five junior colleges having priority systems listed length of service as the basis twenty-two times; rank, five times; need, nineteen times; and other, six times. The emphasis which was placed upon length of service and need by the private junior colleges parallels very closely the emphasis placed on these two factors by the public junior colleges.

The most surprising finding in this study of faculty housing was

TABLE XLV
EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY HOUSING PROGRAM
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	7	1		4	2	
1,001 - 2,000	2		1	1		
2,001 - 5,000	1		1			
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	10	1	2	5	2	
Per Cent	100.0%	10.0%	20.0%	50.0%	20.0%	

TABLE XLVI
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
HAVING COLLEGE-OWNED HOUSING

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Having College-Owned Housing	Per Cent Having College-Owned Housing
0 - 1,000	86	59	68.6%
1,001 - 2,000	9	5	55.6
2,001 - 5,000	4	1	25.0
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	65	65.7%

TABLE XLVII

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES USING A PRIORITY
SYSTEM IN THE ASSIGNMENT OF HOUSING AND THE TYPE OF
PRIORITY SYSTEM USED

Size of College	Housing	Number Having Priority System	Per Cent Having Priority System	Type of Priority System		
				Length of Service	Rank	Need Other
0 - 1,000	59	33	55.9%	22	5	18 5
1,001 - 2,000	5	1	20.0			1
2,001 - 5,000	1	1	100.0			1
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	65	35	53.8%	22	5	19 6

that the percent of the private junior colleges which provided housing in lieu of compensation turned out to be exactly the same as the percentage for the public junior colleges. This comparison is perhaps dimmed a little by the very small number of public junior colleges having college-owned housing; but nonetheless, for the colleges in this study, the data suggests a very close parallel between the public and private colleges. Table XLVIII shows that twenty-six, or 40.0 per cent, of the private junior colleges provide housing in lieu of compensation, which is the same as the per cent for the public junior colleges in Table XLIV.

The evaluation of the faculty housing program by the private junior colleges, shown in Table XLIX, indicates a slightly higher per cent rating the program superior or good than did the public junior colleges. A total of 10.8 per cent rated the program superior, 30.8 per cent rated it good, 38.4 per cent rated it average, 15.4 per cent rated it poor, 3.1 per cent rated it very poor, and 1.5 per cent gave no evaluation. Most of the difference between the public and private junior colleges lies in the difference between the "good" and "average" ratings. The private colleges rated the program good in 30.8 per cent of the colleges; and 38.4 per cent of the private colleges rated the program average, as compared with 50.0 per cent for the public colleges.

TABLE XLVIII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES
PROVIDING HOUSING IN LIEU OF COMPENSATION

Size of College	Number Having Housing	Number Furnishing Housing in Lieu of Compensation	Per Cent Furnishing Housing in Lieu of Compensation
0 - 1,000	59	26	44.1%
1,001 - 2,000	5		
2,001 - 5,000	1		
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	65	26	40.0%

TABLE XLIX
EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY HOUSING PROGRAM
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	59	7	20	21	8	2	1
1,001 - 2,000	5			4	1		
2,001 - 5,000	1				1		
Over 5,000							
All Colleges	65	7	20	25	10	2	1
Per Cent	100.0%	10.8%	30.8%	38.4%	15.4%	3.1%	1.5%

CHAPTER X

FACULTY FAMILY EDUCATION

Public Junior Colleges. In the study of tuition-waiver policies with regard to faculty families, it was found that a relatively small percentage of the public junior colleges provided any amount of tuition waiver for faculty members and their families. The policies were frequently governed by state laws on the subject and were thus uniform for colleges within a given state. In California, for example, where state law provides for tuition-free junior colleges, the question of tuition waivers proved meaningless. Because of this special factor, the public junior colleges in California were excluded from consideration in this section of the questionnaire. Obviously, where there is no tuition charge, there can be no tuition-waiver policy.

Table L shows the number and per cent of the public junior colleges providing tuition waivers for faculty children, faculty members, and their spouses. The public junior colleges in California are excluded from this table since they have no tuition charge. The table shows that 20.0 per cent of the colleges provide some tuition waiver for faculty children, 48.6 per cent provide some tuition waiver for faculty members, and 18.1 per cent provide some tuition waiver for faculty spouses. The per cent is very close, and relatively low, for children and spouses, but somewhat higher for faculty members. Of course the tuition waiver would be used by a faculty member only where he was taking a course for audit purposes or as a matter of personal interest since these are junior colleges.

The responses from the public junior colleges tend to suggest that

TABLE I

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
WAIVERS OF PART OR ALL OF THE TUITION CHARGE FOR
FACULTY MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Children		Number Providing Waiver of Tuition for		Spouse	
		Per Cent	Faculty	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent	Per Cent
0 - 1,000	43	8	18.6%	18	41.7%	9	20.9%
1,001 - 2,000	31	6	19.4	14	45.2	3	9.7
2,001 - 5,000	22	6	27.3	15	68.2	5	22.7
Over 5,000	9	1	11.1	4	44.4	2	22.2
All Colleges	105*	21	20.0%	51	48.6%	19	18.1%

*The number of colleges excludes eighteen California junior colleges which were not used in this table because there is no tuition charge in California.

one of the major reasons why such a small per cent of these colleges give tuition waivers to faculty members and their families is that the applicable state laws forbid tuition waivers.

The evaluation of the faculty family education program by the public junior colleges is shown in Table LI. The ratings are relatively low, although not quite as low as the ratings for the college-owned housing program. Overall, 39.6 per cent of the colleges rated the program as superior or good, 35.8 per cent rated the program as average, and the remaining 24.8 per cent rated the program poor or lower.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges indicated that a much greater per cent provided some tuition waiver for faculty children, faculty members, and their spouses. Table LII shows that a total of 85.9 per cent provide tuition waivers for faculty children, 91.9 per cent provide tuition waivers for faculty members, and 75.8 per cent provide them for their spouses. All of these percentages are significantly higher than the comparable figures for the public junior colleges. The absence of state laws forbidding tuition waivers possibly contributes in part to this higher percentage, as well as a possible tendency among private junior colleges to provide this kind of benefit to partially offset generally lower average salary scales. This would contribute, however, to the benefit only of the faculty member with college-age children.

In their evaluation of the faculty-family-education program, the private junior colleges rated the program substantially higher than did their public counterparts. Among the private schools, 33.3 per cent rated the program superior as compared with 15.1 per cent of the public colleges, 43.0 per cent rated the program good as compared with 24.5 per cent of the

TABLE LI
EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY FAMILY EDUCATION PROGRAM
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	18	3	4	7	3	1	
1,001 - 2,000	16	2	4	6	2	1	1
2,001 - 5,000	15	2	3	6	4		
Over 5,000	4	1	2			1	
All Colleges	53	8	13	19	9	3	1
Per Cent	100.0%	15.1%	24.5%	35.8%	17.0%	5.7%	1.9%

TABLE LII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
WAIVERS OF PART OR ALL OF THE TUITION CHARGE FOR
FACULTY MEMBERS AND THEIR FAMILIES

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Children		Number Providing Waiver of Tuition for		Faculty		Spouse	
		Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent	Number	Per Cent
0 - 1,000	86	73	84.9%	78	90.7%	64	74.4%		
1,001 - 2,000	9	8	88.9	9	100.0	8	88.9		
2,001 - 5,000	4	4	100.0	4	100.0	3	75.0		
Over 5,000									
All Colleges	99	85	85.9%	91	91.9%	75	75.8%		

public colleges; and only 16.2 per cent rated the program average as compared with 35.8 per cent for the public colleges. The remaining colleges, 23.7 per cent of the private colleges and 24.6 per cent of the public colleges, rated the program poor or lower. Table LIII presents the evaluation of the private junior colleges.

TABLE LIII
EVALUATION OF THE FACULTY FAMILY EDUCATION PROGRAM
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	80	23	37	13	4		3
1,001 - 2,000	9	5	3	1			
2,001 - 5,000	4	3		1			
Over 5,000							
All Colleges	93	31	40	15	4		3
Per Cent	100.0%	33.3%	43.0%	16.2%	4.3%		3.2%

CHAPTER XI

MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAMS

Public Junior Colleges. None of the 123 public junior colleges responding to the survey provided mortgage loan programs. Therefore, no further study was possible as far as this program was concerned among the public junior colleges. It can be said only that there were no mortgage loan programs being provided by the public junior colleges studied in this survey.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges were found to provide mortgage loan programs in a very few colleges. As Table LIV shows, only seven of the ninety-nine private junior colleges, or 7.1 per cent, provide this program. There was no evidence from this survey of any general acceptance of a need for mortgage loan programs in junior colleges, and the only significance in the figures concerning mortgage loan programs may be in the fact that they are small.

The evaluation of the mortgage loan program by the seven private junior colleges providing such a program, indicate a relatively high rating for the program. Among these seven colleges, 28.6 per cent rated the program superior, 42.9 per cent rated the program good, and 28.5 per cent rated the program average. None rated the program lower than average. The evaluations are presented in Table IV.

TABLE LIV

NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
A PLAN FOR MORTGAGE LOANS TO FACULTY MEMBERS

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Mortgage Loans	Per Cent Providing Mortgage Loans
0 - 1,000	86	6	7.0%
1,001 - 2,000	9	1	11.1
2,001 - 5,000	4		
Over 5,000			
All Colleges	99	7	7.1%

TABLE LV
EVALUATION OF THE MORTGAGE LOAN PROGRAM
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor
0 - 1,000	6	2	2		2	
1,001 - 2,000	1		1			
2,001 - 5,000						
Over 5,000						
All Colleges	7	2	3		2	
Per Cent	100.0%	28.6%	42.9%		28.5%	

CHAPTER XII

PERSONAL LOAN PROGRAMS

Public Junior Colleges. The responses to this section of the survey indicated that only a very small percentage of the public junior colleges provided either credit unions serving the college faculty only, or maintained any provision for personal loans to faculty members from college funds. Table LVI shows that only a total of 15.4 per cent provided credit unions for their faculty, and only 4.9 per cent maintained any provisions for making personal loans to faculty members from college funds.

In their evaluation of the personal loan programs, presented in Table LVII, a total of 45.0 per cent rated the programs in the top two categories of superior and good, 35.0 per cent rated them average, 5.0 per cent rated them poor, and a high 15.0 per cent gave no evaluation.

Private Junior Colleges. The private junior colleges were found to provide credit unions for college faculty in only 3.0 per cent of the colleges. This was lower than the 15.4 per cent of the public junior colleges which provided credit unions. The percentage of private junior colleges which made personal loans from college funds was 29.3 per cent. This was considerably higher than the 4.9 per cent of the public junior colleges which indicated that personal loans were made from college funds. Table LVIII presents the data on the number and per cent of private junior colleges providing credit unions and

TABLE LVI
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
CREDIT UNIONS FOR COLLEGE FACULTY ONLY AND PROGRAMS
FOR MAKING PERSONAL LOANS TO FACULTY BY THE COLLEGE

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Faculty Credit Unions	Per Cent Providing Faculty Credit Unions	Number Providing Personal Loan Programs	Per Cent Providing Personal Loan Programs
0 - 1,000	44	4	9.1%	1	2.3%
1,000 - 2,000	32	5	15.6	2	6.3
2,001 - 5,000	30	7	23.3	2	6.7
Over 5,000	17	3	17.6	1	5.9
All Colleges	123	19	15.4%	6	4.9%

TABLE LVII

EVALUATION OF PERSONAL LOAN PROGRAMS
BY PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	5		3	1			1
1,001 - 2,000	5	1	2	1	1		
2,001 - 5,000	7	1	1	4			1
Over 5,000	3		1	1			1
All Colleges	20	2	7	7	1		3
Per Cent	100.0%	10.0%	35.0%	35.0%	5.0%		15.0%

Five of the public junior colleges had credit unions and also indicated that personal loans were made sometimes directly from college funds. One public junior college made loans only from college funds. There were twenty different public junior colleges providing one or both of these programs.

TABLE LVIII
NUMBER AND PER CENT OF PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES PROVIDING
CREDIT UNIONS FOR COLLEGE FACULTY ONLY AND PROGRAMS
FOR MAKING PERSONAL LOANS TO FACULTY BY THE COLLEGE

Size of College	Number of Colleges	Number Providing Faculty Credit Unions	Per Cent Providing Faculty Credit Unions	Number Providing Personal Loan Programs	Per Cent Providing Personal Loan Programs
0 - 1,000	86	2	2.3%	26	30.2%
1,001 - 2,000	9			2	22.2
2,001 - 5,000	4	1	25.0	1	25.0
Over 5,000					
All Colleges	99	3	3.0%	29	29.3%

institutional programs for personal loans.

The private junior colleges rated these programs somewhat lower than the public junior colleges. As shown in Table LIX, these programs were rated in the top two categories of superior and good by a total of 34.4 per cent of the colleges. They were rated average by 50.0 per cent, and poor by 6.3 per cent; and no evaluation was given by 9.3 per cent.

TABLE LIX

EVALUATION OF PERSONAL LOAN PROGRAMS
BY PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Size of College	Total	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation
0 - 1,000	28	1	6	16	2		3
1,001 - 2,000	2	1	1				
2,001 - 5,000	2		2				
Over 5,000							
All Colleges	32	2	9	16	2		3
Per Cent	100.0%	6.3%	28.1%	50.0%	6.3%		9.3%

CHAPTER XIII

EVALUATIONS OF FRINGE BENEFIT PROGRAMS

The tables on the following pages present the evaluation of the fringe benefit programs by the public and private groups of junior colleges which responded to the survey. Throughout this study the evaluations used were those given by the colleges which indicated in their responses to the questionnaire that they provided the fringe benefit programs. In some cases, colleges which did not provide a particular fringe benefit program completed the evaluation section anyway. These evaluations were excluded since the intent was to develop an overall evaluation of these fringe benefit programs by colleges which had direct experience in offering the programs.

The summaries of the evaluations show a mean-rating which was obtained by establishing a point scale for the five possible ratings. A superior rating was assigned a value of five; good, four; average, three; poor, two; and very poor, one. In those cases in which a college provided a particular program but declined to give an evaluation, a rating of zero was assigned. Using these assigned values, mean-ratings were computed for each fringe benefit program.

The resulting mean-ratings for each fringe benefit program were surprisingly similar in most cases for both the public junior colleges and the private junior colleges. Except for Faculty Family Education and Mortgage Loans, there were no mean-ratings which varied more than .22 of a point between the public junior college ratings and the private junior college ratings. None of the public junior colleges responding

to the survey indicated that any provisions were made for mortgage loan programs; therefore, there was only a zero rating possible. In the private junior colleges, seven of the colleges responding indicated that mortgage loans were sometimes made; and their evaluations resulted in a mean-rating of 3.71, as shown in Table LX. The public junior colleges gave a mean-rating of 3.21 to the Faculty Family Education programs, while the private junior colleges gave a higher mean-rating of 3.96.

The program receiving the highest mean-rating among the public junior colleges was Tenure. Health and Life Insurance ranked second; Sabbatical Leaves, third; Retirement Programs, fourth; Faculty Travel, fifth; Faculty Family Education, sixth; Faculty Housing, seventh; Personal Loans, eighth; and Mortgage Loans received no rating, thus ranking ninth. The lowest mean-rating for all of the programs other than Mortgage Loans was 3.05 for Personal Loans. This was only .01 points below the 3.06 mean-rating given to Personal Loans by the private junior colleges.

Among the evaluations for the private junior colleges, presented in Table LXI, Health and Life Insurance received the highest mean-rating of 4.15. Retirement Programs ranked second; Faculty Family Education, third; Tenure, fourth; Sabbatical Leaves, fifth; Mortgage Loans, sixth; Faculty Travel, seventh; Faculty Housing, eighth; and Personal loans ranked ninth.

It had been hoped that some tests could be made of the means of the ratings for the various fringe benefit programs. Had there been an equal number of junior colleges reporting the provision of each fringe benefit program, an L_1 test could have been used to determine whether

TABLE IX
EVALUATIONS OF FRINGE BENEFIT PROGRAMS BY
PUBLIC JUNIOR COLLEGES

Fringe Benefit Program	Number of Colleges	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation	Mean Rating	Ranking
Retirement Programs . . .	108	34	44	18	9	1	2	3.89	4
Health and Life Insurance	96	36	31	24	4		1	4.00	2
Tenure	89	30	42	14	3			4.11	1
Sabbatical Leaves	71	20	31	16	4			3.94	3
Faculty Travel	123	12	56	39	8	3	5	3.41	5
Faculty Housing	10	1	2	5	2			3.20	7
Faculty Family Education	53	8	13	19	9	3	1	3.21	6
Mortgage Loans	None							0.00	9
Personal Loans	20	2	7	7	1		3	3.05	8

TABLE LXI
EVALUATIONS OF FRINGE BENEFIT PROGRAMS BY
PRIVATE JUNIOR COLLEGES

Fringe Benefit Program	Number of Colleges	Superior	Good	Average	Poor	Very Poor	No Evaluation	Mean Rating	Ranking
Retirement Programs . . .	88	22	47	16	3			4.00	2
Health and Life Insurance	93	36	38	16	3			4.15	1
Tenure	63	9	40	12	2			3.89	4
Sabbatical Leaves	47	9	23	13	1			3.79	5
Faculty Travel	99	11	39	40	8	1		3.52	7
Faculty Housing	65	7	20	25	10	2	1	3.25	8
Faculty Family Education	93	31	40	15	4		3	3.95	3
Mortgage Loans	7	2	3		2			3.71	6
Personal Loans	32	2	9	16	2		3	3.06	9

the individual ratings for each of the fringe benefit programs belonged to the normal populations of the same variance, with no stipulation being made as to the mean. Had this tended to show that the ratings did have the same variance, the L_1 test could have been followed by an F test to determine whether these ratings belonged to normal populations whose means were appreciably the same and whose variances were assumed to be the same. However, due to the fact that equal sample sizes did not exist, it was not possible to use these tests, since their use depends to this condition being met.

Had it been possible to use the L_1 test and the F test it might have been possible to determine statistically whether any of the fringe benefit programs seemed significantly more or less important to the junior colleges providing the programs.

Consideration was given to the possibility of developing meaningful correlations between the rating given each program and the average per cent for annual faculty turnover indicated by the respondents. However, preliminary investigation of this possibility by preparing scattergrams did not tend to support the possibility of any significant correlations. Some colleges, for example, rated their programs superior, but at the same time indicated annual faculty turnover rates of 20 or 30 per cent. On the surface, this would tend to suggest that these fringe benefit programs did not make a significant contribution, at least to retaining faculty members. However, the impossibility of having accurate control of the percentages of faculty turnover, or of eliminating other possible variables, made it impossible to draw firm conclusions here.

CHAPTER XIV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The results of the survey supported the hypothesis that fringe benefit programs were necessary to recruit and retain quality faculty members. Although a higher degree of importance and significance was attached to some of the fringe benefit programs by the junior colleges, the data obtained in the study did support the positive value of the fringe benefit programs studied.

The public junior colleges provided retirement programs in 87.8 per cent of the schools responding to the survey, and 88.8 per cent of the private junior colleges responding indicated that a retirement program was provided. This ratio of almost nine out of ten junior colleges providing this benefit indicated that retirement programs were highly regarded by the junior colleges, and that there was almost an equal emphasis on retirement benefits by both the public and the private junior colleges. The public junior colleges gave retirement programs a mean-rating of 3.89, and the private junior colleges gave a rating of 4.00 to retirement benefits.

Among the public junior colleges, a total of 78.0 per cent provided some form of group health insurance, and 46.5 per cent provided a group life insurance program. The private junior colleges indicated that a somewhat greater emphasis was placed on these benefits in that 89.9 per cent provided group health insurance programs and 64.6 per cent provided group life insurance programs. The insurance benefits

were given slightly higher mean-ratings by both the public and the private junior colleges than were given to retirement benefits. The public schools gave a mean-rating of 4.00, and the private schools gave a mean-rating of 4.15.

The public junior colleges were found to provide tenure in a higher percentage of schools than the private junior colleges. Tenure programs were provided by 72.4 per cent of the public schools, and by 63.6 per cent of the private schools. Tenure ranked high among the fringe benefit programs, with a mean-rating of 4.11 given by the public schools and a mean-rating of 3.89 given by the private schools.

Sabbatical leave programs were provided by a majority (57.7 per cent) of the public junior colleges, but only 47.5 per cent of the private junior colleges provided this benefit. The public junior colleges required tenure as a condition for eligibility for sabbatical leaves in 76.1 per cent of the schools, whereas only 38.3 per cent of the private junior colleges required tenure as a requisite for eligibility for sabbatical leaves. A mean-rating of 3.94 was given to sabbatical leave benefits by the public junior colleges, while the private junior colleges gave it a mean-rating of 3.79.

Faculty travel programs were governed by some specific policy in 46.3 per cent of the public junior colleges, while 57.6 per cent of the private junior colleges had specific policies governing the limits of faculty travel. The public junior colleges gave faculty travel a mean-rating of 3.41 as compared with the rating of 3.52 given by the private junior colleges, showing little difference

between them in their rating of this program for its contribution to recruiting and retaining faculty.

College-owned housing was provided by only 8.1 per cent of the public junior colleges, but 65.7 per cent of the private junior colleges provided college-owned housing. This disparity in the emphasis on college-owned housing did not reflect itself in any significant difference in the mean-ratings given to college-owned housing by the public and private schools. The public junior colleges gave college-owned housing a mean-rating of 3.20, while the private junior colleges gave a mean-rating of 3.26. As in the case of all of the fringe benefits, the ratings were given only by those schools which had college-owned housing so they reflect the evaluations of only those schools.

Faculty family education benefits were much more restricted in the public than in the private junior colleges. Many public schools were subject to restrictive state regulations prohibiting waivers of tuition for families of faculty members. Only 20.0 per cent of the public junior colleges provided waivers of tuition for children, 48.6 per cent provided waivers of tuition for faculty members, and 18.1 per cent provided waivers of tuition for husbands or wives of faculty members. Among the private junior colleges, 85.9 per cent provided waivers of tuition for children, 91.9 per cent provided waivers of tuition for faculty members, and 75.8 per cent provided tuition waivers for husbands or wives of faculty members. The private junior colleges ranked this benefit relatively high, giving it a mean-rating

of 3.96, while the public junior colleges gave a mean-rating of 3.21.

Mortgage loans were not made by any of the public junior colleges responding to the survey, and only 7.1 per cent of the private junior colleges indicated that they had any provisions for making mortgage loans. Those private schools which made mortgage loans gave this benefit a mean-rating of 3.71.

Credit unions serving only the faculty were provided by 15.4 per cent of the public junior colleges and by 3.0 per cent of the private junior colleges. Other personal loan programs were provided by only 4.9 per cent of the public schools and 29.3 per cent of the private schools. Personal loan programs were given a mean-rating of 3.05 by the public junior colleges, and a mean-rating of 3.06 by the private junior colleges.

The weighting of the fringe benefits, as shown in Table LX and Table LXI on pages 112 and 113, supported the hypothesis that fringe benefits do attract and retain faculty members. Relatively high mean-ratings were given for retirement benefits, health and life insurance programs, tenure, sabbatical leave programs, and, in the case of the private junior colleges, for faculty family education programs. These five fringe benefits were given the highest priority, as shown by the ranking of the mean-ratings in Tables LX and LXI; and because of the frequency with which these benefits were found to occur, the provision of these benefit programs will assure the competitive position of junior colleges for recruiting and retaining faculty. Without these benefits junior colleges will find themselves at a

disadvantage in securing qualified faculty members.

Mortgage loan programs and personal loan programs were found to exist in very few colleges and to have relatively low ratings where they did exist. Also, the mean-ratings for faculty travel programs and college-owned housing indicated that very low priority was given to these programs by the responding institutions.

Among the public junior colleges the four top-ranked fringe benefits were: (1) tenure, (2) health and life insurance, (3) sabbatical leaves, and (4) retirement programs, as indicated by the rankings given by the mean-ratings in Table LX. The four top-ranked fringe benefits in the private junior colleges, as indicated by the mean-ratings in Table LXI, were: (1) health and life insurance, (2) retirement programs, (3) faculty family education, and (4) tenure. Sabbatical leaves were ranked fifth by the private junior colleges, very close behind the four top-ranked benefits.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

Greenough, William C., and Francis P. King. Retirement and Insurance Plans in American Colleges. New York: Columbia University Press, 1959.

Ingraham, Mark H. The Outer Fringe, Faculty Benefits Other Than Annuities and Insurance. Madison: The University of Wisconsin Press, 1965.

Reynolds, James W. The Junior College. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1965.

B. PERIODICALS

American Association of University Professors Bulletin. "Academic Retirement and Related Subjects," XXXVI (March, 1950), pp. 97-117.

Blume, Norman. "Faculty Fringe Benefits," Improving College and University Teaching, XIV, No. 4 (Autumn, 1966), pp. 270-272.

Dingman, Erwin. "School Practices in Fringe Benefits," The American School Board Journal, CXLIII, No. 2 (August, 1961), pp. 7-8.

Greenough, William C. "Retirement Planning in Private Colleges and Universities," Liberal Education, XLV (December, 1959), pp. 564-577.

Heim, Peggy, and William J. Baumol. "On the Fringe, the State of Retirement Contributions and Other Non-pecuniary Faculty Benefits," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, XLVIII (December, 1962), pp. 346-358.

Ingraham, Mark H. "Other Benefits," American Association of University Professors Bulletin, LI (March, 1965), pp. 26-29.

King, Francis P. "Insurance Programs in Private Colleges and Universities," Liberal Education, XLVI (October, 1960), pp. 331-344.

Lurie, Melvin. "Toward a Survey of Faculty-Turnover Rates; Increasing the Effectiveness of Manpower Management in Higher Education," Journal of Higher Education, XXXVII (October, 1966), pp. 389-395.

Marshall, Howard D. "Supply of Faculty Housing," Liberal Education, LI (December, 1965), p. 537.

Maul, Roy C. "Are Junior College Salaries Competitive?" Junior College Journal, XXXIV (March, 1964), pp. 20-23.

Serbein, Oscar N. "Fringe Benefit Programs and Salaries in Forty-nine Colleges and Universities," Higher Education, XIV, No. 2 (October, 1957), pp. 17-22.

U. S. News and World Report. "Fringe Binge--It Costs More Every Year," 60 (May 2, 1966), pp. 76-78, 99.

C. ORGANIZATIONS

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1966 Junior College Directory. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1966.

American Association of Junior Colleges. 1968 Junior College Directory. Washington: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1968.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR THE STUDY OF FRINGE BENEFITS
IN A SELECTED GROUP OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

STUDY OF FRINGE BENEFITS IN A SELECTED
GROUP OF JUNIOR COLLEGES

1. Name of Junior College _____
2. Total enrollment:
 Under 1,000 _____
 1,000 - 2,000 _____
 2,000 - 5,000 _____
 Over 5,000 _____
3. Type of institution:
 Private _____
 State _____
 Community _____
 Church-related _____
4. Number of faculty members _____
5. Per cent of annual turnover of faculty members _____

SCALE FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

- Superior. A very positive contribution to the recruiting as indicated by faculty reaction and comment.
- Good. Definite contribution to recruiting, but less positive indication from faculty members.
- Average. Some contribution to recruiting, but not significantly.
- Poor. Very little contribution to recruiting faculty.
- Very poor. No contribution to recruiting faculty.

SECTION 1 - RETIREMENT

1. Does your institution provide a retirement plan for your faculty members?
 Yes _____
 No _____ (If no, go to section 2.)

2. Does your institution pay a certain portion of the premium?

Yes _____
No _____

3. Would you characterize your retirement plan as:

Superior _____
Good _____
Average _____
Poor _____
Very poor _____

SECTION 2 - INSURANCE

1. Does your institution provide group health and/or life insurance programs for your faculty members?

Yes _____ Health insurance _____
No _____ (If no, go to section 3.) Life insurance _____

2. Does your institution pay a portion of the health insurance premium?

Yes _____
No _____

3. Does your institution pay a portion of the life insurance premium?

Yes _____
No _____

4. Would you characterize your health and life insurance plans as:

Superior _____
Good _____
Average _____
Poor _____
Very poor _____

SECTION 3 - TENURE

1. Does your institution provide a plan for tenure for your faculty members?

Yes _____
No _____ (If no, go to section 4.)

2. How many years of service are required for eligibility?

_____ years

3. Are there other requirements for eligibility for tenure? (Please describe, if any.)
4. Would you characterize your tenure program as:
- Superior _____
- Good _____
- Average _____
- Poor _____
- Very poor _____

SECTION 4 - SABBATICAL LEAVES

1. Does your institution have a program for granting sabbatical leaves to your faculty members?
- Yes _____
- No _____ (If no, go to section 5.)
2. What is the minimum number of years of service required before the first sabbatical may be taken?
- _____ years
3. Is tenure a requirement?
- Yes _____
- No _____
4. How many years of service must be completed after one sabbatical before one may become eligible for another?
- _____ years
5. Please describe any conditions other than service required for receiving the sabbatical leave.
6. Would you characterize your program for sabbatical leaves as:
- Superior _____
- Good _____
- Average _____
- Poor _____
- Very poor _____

SECTION 5 - FACULTY TRAVEL EXPENSE

1. Are there specified limits (cost, number of trips, distance) within which any one faculty member may be reimbursed for travel in a given year?
Yes _____
No _____
2. If the faculty member uses his own automobile, what formula is used to determine the amount due him?
3. Does your institution pay moving expenses of newly hired faculty members?
Yes _____
No _____
If yes, limits _____
4. Would you characterize your program for faculty travel expense as:
Superior _____
Good _____
Average _____
Poor _____
Very poor _____

SECTION 6 - FACULTY HOUSING

1. Does your institution own houses or apartments in which faculty members live?
Yes _____
No _____ (If no, go to section 7.)
2. Does your institution use a priority system in assigning faculty housing?
Yes _____
No _____
If yes, please check:
By length of service _____
By rank _____
By need _____
Other _____

3. Are any faculty housing units furnished as part of compensation (in lieu of monetary compensation)?
Yes _____
No _____
4. Would you characterize your faculty housing program as:
Superior _____
Good _____
Average _____
Poor _____
Very poor _____

SECTION 7 - FACULTY FAMILY EDUCATION

1. Does your institution provide a waiver of tuition if a child of a faculty member attends your institution?
Yes _____
No _____
2. May a faculty member attend classes in your institution without a tuition charge?
Yes _____
No _____
3. May the spouse of a faculty member attend your institution without a tuition charge?
Yes _____
No _____
4. Would you characterize your faculty family education program as:
Superior _____
Good _____
Average _____
Poor _____
Very poor _____

SECTION 8 - MORTGAGE LOANS

1. Does your institution make mortgage loans on the homes of your faculty members?
Yes _____
No _____ (If no, go to section 9.)

2. Would you characterize your mortgage loan program as:

Superior_____

Good_____

Average_____

Poor_____

Very poor_____

SECTION 9 - PERSONAL LOANS

1. Does your institution have a faculty credit union serving college personnel only?

Yes_____

No_____

2. Does your institution make personal loans to faculty members?

Yes_____

No_____

3. Would you characterize your personal loan program as:

Superior_____

Good_____

Average_____

Poor_____

Very poor_____